

# The Classical Review

APRIL 1899.

*The Editor of the CLASSICAL REVIEW will be glad to receive short paragraphs (or materials for such paragraphs) upon classical topics of current interest. These should reach him as early as possible in the month preceding the publication of the REVIEW.*

THE Cambridge Senate rejected by considerable majorities the proposals of the Board of Classics for changes in the Classical Tripos. The *status quo* has accordingly been reaffirmed; but the substantial minority, 89 out of 208 votes, which supported the grace to take away from Part I. its power to qualify for a degree, shows an amount of discontent with the present régime which will have yet to be reckoned with.

From the Annual Report of the President of Harvard College, a very interesting document, we learn that the new degrees of Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Literature, and Bachelor of Philosophy in America are rapidly gaining ground on the old degree of Bachelor of Arts. At Harvard, which confers Baccalaureates in Art and Science only, the students in Arts have increased from 1127 to 1650 since 1890-91, but those in Science have grown from 27 to 319. In the advanced or Graduate School, Modern Languages (including English), History and Political Science, and Philosophy are the three subjects most favoured, 'Classics with Sanskrit making a good fourth.' Amongst other points to which the Report draws attention, two are of special interest on this side of the Atlantic—the success of the institution of scholarships without stipend, and the age of those who take the higher degrees (Master or Doctor) of whom, in the year 1898, 49 out of 121 were 28 or over, and 61 were 27 or over. On this the Report comments: 'The figures are formidable . . . For such men two-fifths of their seventy years are over before they are able to support themselves.'

Students of Greek Palaeography may be interested to know that, by the kind permission  
NO. CXIII. VOL. XIII.

of the authorities of the Imperial Library at Petersburg, the MS. Gr. LXII. (according to Muralt's Catalogue) is at present lying in the University Library at Cambridge. It will probably remain there till the middle of May. Its chief interest lies in the fact that it is the continuation in minuscule characters of the Bodleian Genesis. The uncial and minuscule parts of the same manuscript were acquired by Tischendorf on two different journeys to the East. The Petersburg part of the MS. is stated to be in three different hands, all probably of the tenth century. Whether the uncial part is earlier is regarded as an open question. A more detailed account of the MS. will be given in the May number of the *Classical Review*.

Prof. Buck's contributions to this journal must arouse in us all a keen sense of the want of a full and up-to-date treatment of Latin orthography. Yet the need does not lie so much in ignorance upon many points of detail as in an inability to grasp the general issues of the question.

Three motives (principles it would be grotesque to call them) may be traced through the mass of inarticulate opinions, a desire for correctness, a desire for consistency and a rooted aversion to change. The first and the last are most observable in the average teacher who is ever prone to conduct his pupils in pursuit of truth by easier paths than nature has intended. The deadly character of this combination under favourable circumstances may be seen from the utterances of the promoters of *Præco Latinus* and M. Fouillé. 'Why, indeed, should we spell *cottidie* for *quotidie*, if we do not say *cotus*...why intellego for intelligo, if not interfacio for interficio!...Quite often is

the Greek origin so manifest, that a child can see it, though they [*i.e.* "our etymologists"] ignore, or question it, and tell us that the spelling of such words is *wrong*, like *sylva coelum, coelebs, ceteri*; but should spell: *silva, caelum, caelebs, ceteri*; yet these words are acknowledged to be Greek words; no imaginable cause can be assigned for a different spelling, excepting the morbid craving for contrariety' (*Academia Gentium Latina*, p. 17). 'La griffe des philologues se retrouve dans le besoin qu'on a éprouvé, au moment même où les études latines étaient battues en brèche, d'en compliquer encore la difficulté en modifiant l'orthographe latine selon les découvertes les plus récentes des érudits. Par exemple, le professeur de latin était heureux autrefois de dire; *adolescens* est devenu en français *adolescent*; aujourd'hui, nos enfants écrivent: *adulescens*, ce qui brouille un peu plus leurs idées. On dit en français *intelligent*, adoptons pour nos élèves *intelligens*: ce sera plus *intelligible*!... Virgile s'appelle en latin *Vergilius*: finira-t-on par l'appeler en français *Vergile*?' (*Les études classiques et la démocratie*, p. 94). Yes, we may answer to the last question of M. Fouillé, if France is to follow the lead of England whose Virgil seems already doomed. This simple hatred of change, however unreasonable we may think it, is still not without its temporary advantage if it delays the introduction of a new system but imperfectly accredited. And, as we may gather from Prof. Buck, even in America there is a not inconsiderable risk of overhaste, while here, it is rumoured, a great University is about to do in an orthographical series of Latin texts on the crumbling foundations of Brambach.

The desire for consistency itself conflicts with the striving after correctness, though not to the same extent. There is a false consistency as well as a true. The latter will remove the contradictions which now disfigure our texts, where tradition has combined the spellings of different ages. If there is any certainty in these matters, it is certain that Lucretius did not write *linquontur* in iii. 713 and *lincuntur* in iii. 714, as he is made to do in Lachmann's and Munro's editions; and although the fact that the contemporary spelling has been preserved in one line and modernized in the next, is without doubt to be recorded, the text of an edition for 'school and college use' is not the place. But what are we to think of a uniformity which obliterates contemporary varieties of spelling, as in the assimilation of prepositions in compounds, and makes the Romans

consistent where it is notorious that they were not? What is this but a falsification of antiquity? The conscience of the age is against the sham antique, and not even pedagogical reasons require this particular spurious to be forced upon the market. In all except the most elementary books it would be enough to teach the more usual, or the more reasonable, of two rival spellings and to warn the student that he may expect to find the other one in the course of his reading.

What again can we say when considerations of consistency and correctness are disregarded by the orthographical reformers themselves? It is well known that to two of the ancient Roman vowels there were consonants so nearly allied that each pair was expressed by a single sign. The practice of writing *i* alone in the one case and both *u* and *v* in the other has nothing but present use in its favour: yet no scheme that has been formulated includes a proposal to write both *i j* and *u v* on grounds of consistency, or *i, u* only on grounds of consistency and correctness. We have indeed seen (and the sight is a strange one) the *j* revived in scientific expositions of Latin etymology and textual criticism, where it puts one more obstacle in the way of a student's comprehension of the tradition of texts and the relationship of sounds, although the simple device of an italic letter would have satisfied every need for discrimination. But *juvit*, though not correct, is at any rate consistent; *iuvit* is neither. The world has no place for such half-rights. Talma, we used to read, played Agamemnon in a wig and a snuffbox; but we have yet to hear of that hero being represented with a buckler and an umbrella.

The whole question has been further embarrassed by a confusion of spelling and pronunciation. Those who are told for the first time that the *spelling* of the accusative of 'three' in classical Latin fluctuated between *tres*, to which they have been accustomed, and *tris* to which they have not, may not unnaturally regard this as a needless uncertainty about a trifling detail. But the matter will assume a different aspect if they realize that these were two distinct *forms* with vowels as dissimilar as those of *trees* and *trace*, and that, according to the unimpeachable witness of antiquity, the 'wielder of the stateliest measure ever moulded by the lips of men' used either form as the music of his verse demanded, Aulus Gellius xiii. 21.

## SOPHOCLEA.

Ant. 213.

νόμῳ δὲ χρῆσθαι παντί πού γ' ἐνεστί σοι.

Such is Erfurdt's generally accepted conjecture, πούτ' L, which the other MSS. divide into πού τ'. Well might Linwood say: 'Sed certe γ' otiosum sonat.' Besides I do not know in what language one says παντί πού γε; in Greek one says παντί γέ σου. Dindorf's πάρεστι is both sense and Greek, but that is all that can be said for it. I am surprised not to find τοῦτ' suggested, 'to enforce every law, that is in thy power.' For compare 466: ἀλλ' ἂν εἰ τὸν ἐξ ἐμῆς | μητρὸς θανόντ' ἀθαπτον ἡσυχόμεν νέκυν | κείνοις ἂν ἤλαυνον. O.C. 639: εἰ δ' ἐμοῦ στείχειν μέτα | τόδ' ἥδύ. Trach. 458: τὸ μὴ πυθέσθαι, τούτῳ μ' ἀλγύνειν ἂν.

Electra 374.

εἰ μὴ κακὸν μέγιστον εἰς αὐτὴν ἰὼν  
ἦκουσ' ὃ ταύτην τῶν μακρῶν σχίσσει γόων.

It needs surely a poor opinion of Sophocles to believe that he could write ταύτην after αὐτὴν in this way. From Bacchylides v. 110 I propose εἰσάντην ἰὼν. That εἰσάντην would probably be corrupted may be judged from the fact that it was actually corrupted in the first edition of Bacchylides. For the sense compare Ant. 10: πρὸς τοὺς φίλους στείχοντα τῶν ἐχθρῶν κακά. For the tone of the phrase O. T. 324: τὸ σὺν φώνημ' ἰὼν | πρὸς καιρόν. Homer often says ἄντα ἰέναι τὸς and uses ἀντην ἐρχέσθαι for 'to advance' without a case after it; it is easy here to supply a genitive as in the only other place where the word has survived. Sophocles uses ἔαντα (Ant. 1298) in a lyrical passage however; but see Tyrrell on Electra 21 (p. xxii. of his edition).

Talking of Bacchylides I should like to make a belated suggestion on xi. 85:

τὸν δ' εἶλεν ἄχος κραδίαν ξείνα τέ νιν πλάξεν  
μέριμνα.

Here ξείνα is unintelligible and Herwerden's δεινὰ was not likely to be changed to it; the poet wrote perhaps κραδίαν δεινὰ ἢ πλάξεν μέριμνα. The form ἰν is familiar to us as a dative in Pyth. iv. 36, and as τιν is both dative and accusative in Doric, so ἰν has as good a right to the one case as the other, if indeed there ever was such a word. It was sure to be corrupted to νιν, as it was

in Pindar. Then as δεινὰ would not scan it got changed to ξείνα. Or we might start at the other end; in the papyrus an o is sometimes hardly more than a mere dot; in some previous copy with a similar writing δεινὰ might thus easily lose the first letter and ξείνα would then be naturally changed to ξείνα, carrying the rest with it.

Compare then Nem. i. 53. δεινὰς ἀνείασιν τυπείς. But dear me, all this is very speculative.

Ajax 774.

ἀνασσα, τοῖς ἄλλοισιν Ἀργείων πέλας  
ἴστω, καθ' ἡμᾶς δ' οὐποτ' ἐκρήξει μάχη.

No one can explain ἐκρήξει, but the sense required is plain. Help others if you like, but the battle will never break where I stand, i.e. οὐποτε ῥήξει. For μάχη 'used in a concrete sense, as in old English, of the embattled hosts' (Leaf) see *Iliad* A 216, and the phrase στησάμενοι δ' ἐμάχοντο μάχην where στησάσθαι μάχην must mean the same thing. I remember a sentence of Mr. Ruskin's somewhere: 'And all their battle broke before him into flight.' The intransitive use of ῥήγνυμι is rare but Sophoclean; see the lexicon. For the lengthening of the syllable before it compare O. T. 847 εἰς ἐμὲ ῥέπον, frag. 870, Ant. 318, etc. And how likely the lengthening was to cause corruption may be seen from the change of ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπαὶ ῥυτῆρος at O. C. 900 by Triclinius.

Since this was in type I find 'qu. οὐποτε ῥήξει' in Blaydes (1875). But it does not seem to have been considered so much as it deserves.

O.C. 547.

καὶ γὰρ ἄλλους ἐφόνευσα καὶ ἀπόλεσα.

The metre being four dactyls, καὶ ὄλεσα is generally read and ἄλλους variously emended. That ὄλεσα is right seems pretty clear, the last foot being a pure dactyl as every one assumes and the next line beginning with a consonant; therefore this line must end with a vowel. For synaphea in such cases exists with the next line. (So also if a verse ends with a first paeon in cretics.) It is indeed objected that ὄλεσα is weak after ἐφόνευσα, but surely repetitions of this sort are the commonest thing possible, especially in lyrics. Euripides says, διὰ μ' ἐφθίρας κατὰ δ' ἔκτεινας (*Hipp.* 1357).

Did not a celebrated critic of tragedy take exception to the opening of the *Choephori* on the same grounds? δις ταῦτόν ἡμῖν εἶπεν ὁ σοφὸς Αἰσχύλος.

None however of the corrections of ἄλλους are at all satisfactory. Is ἐμούς any better? M is easily written as ΑΑ, and ἔλλους would naturally become ἄλλους.<sup>1</sup> So Antigone speaks of her brother as τῶν ἐμῶν (*Ant.* 48). Cf. τοὺς ἐμούς at *O.C.* 832, and εἰς οὓς τ' ἔδρων said by Oedipus himself of his father, in exactly the same connexion as here, at 976.

Then consider the context, 'I was in a way justified,' says Oedipus, 'in killing my father (not simply in killing my opponent on the occasion) because I did not know who it was: αἰδῶς ἐς τόδ' ἦλθον, and therefore I am νόμῳ καθαρός.' His argument is not that he killed him in self-defence; if it were, what is αἰδῶς doing here? The sense appears to me to demand imperatively some such word as ἐμούς. And 975-978 back it up pretty strongly.

#### *O.C.* 1014.

ὁ ξείνος, ὧναξ, χρηστός· αἱ δὲ συμφοραὶ αὐτοῦ πανώλεις, ἀξίαι δ' ἀμυναθῆν.

'The speech,' say Campbell and Abbott truly, 'shows the vacillation of the Chorus, who are divided between fear of pollution by the presence of Oedipus and the desire to help him.' Exactly, *him* not *it*. What they are commenting on is really ἄξιος. It is impossible to make out that his συμφοραὶ are deserving of help; of pity they are deserving, but that is not what ἀμυναθῆν means. If the συμφοραὶ were the loss of his daughters ἀμυναθῆν would be all very well, but it is clear that they are his parricide and incest, which are past all help now. 'The stranger is a good man (though his calamities are

<sup>1</sup> For the opposite change cf. 1266 τῶλα MSS. τὰμὰ Reiske.

accursed) and deserving of help.' Read then ἄξιος, which was easily corrupted by the neighbourhood of συμφοραὶ, and either change the colon after χρηστός to a comma, or the comma after πανώλεις to a colon.

#### *O.C.* 1733.

ἄγε με καὶ τότ' ἐνάριζον.

So L.; the corresponding line is μέγ' ἄρα πέλαγος ἐλάχeton τι, and the accepted correction of 1733 is Elmsley's καὶ τότ' ἐπενάριζον. Yet τότε is surely, if possible, still not the natural word; you would expect ἔπειτα or εἶτα; and you would expect the second foot to be a tribrach by preference rather than a trochee. Perhaps Sophocles wrote:

ἄγε μ' ἄγε με κατὰ τ' ἐνάριζον.

The first ἄγε μ' was easily dropped and ΚΑΤΑΤΕΝΑΡΙΞΟΝ and ΚΑΙΤΟΤΕΝΑΡΙΞΟΝ are hardly distinguishable. The shifting of the metrical ictus on the same word or words, in ἄγε μ' ἄγε με is a favourite ornament of Sophocles, e.g. *O.T.* 216, αἰτῆς δ' αἰτῆς, 261, κοινῶν τε παίδων κοῖν' ἄν, 1282, ὁ πρὶν παλαιὸς δ' ὄλβος ἦν πάροιθε μὲν | ὄλβος δικαίως, *Phil.* 1041, τείσασθε τείσασθ' ἀλλὰ τῷ χρόνῳ, and any number more in him and others.

The effect is heightened still further if a change of quantity goes along with the change of ictus, as at *Ant.* 1240, κῆται δὲ νεκρὸς περὶ νεκρῷ. So with the beautiful regretful rhythm of Horace's *Postume* | *Postu* | *me* and *ibimus* | *ibi* | *mus*,<sup>1</sup> doubtless imitated from Alcaeus. And compare Milton's *Lycidas*, 'Yet once more O ye laurels and once more.' Swinburne's *Study of Shakespeare*, p. 219.

ARTHUR PLATT.

<sup>1</sup> — — | — — | — —

#### NOTES ON GREEK COMIC FRAGMENTS.

A FRAGMENT of *Epicharmus* is quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus *Strom.* 6, 2, 21 side by side with a saying of Chilon. Chilon said ἐγγύα, παρὰ δ' ἄτα: Epicharmus is reported to have written ἐγγύα ἄτας θυγάτηρ, ἐγγύα δὲ ζαμίας. Lorenz (*Epicharmus* p. 264) says this gives good sense and need not be changed, but, as the three last words

are evidently the end of a trochaic tetrameter, we shall rather agree with Ahrens (*De Graec. Ling. Dial.* 2, 461) who tries to throw the whole into metrical form thus—ἐγγύας ἄτα ὅττι θυγάτηρ, ἐγγύα δὲ ζαμίας. It is hard, however, to see what meaning he attached to these words. The sense obviously requires an inversion of the relations



thus stated: guarantorship, suretyship, giving bail for another man (*ἐγγύα*) is the child of infatuation (*ἄτη*) and loss is the child of suretyship. With this much improved sense the line appears in another conjectural modern form, the exact history of which I do not know: *ἐγγύα θυγάτηρ μὲν ἄτας, ἐγγύας δὲ ζαμία*. It is plain, however, that the words are still not quite right, for there is no proper correspondence in the *μὲν* and *δέ*. Any one who began with *ἐγγύα θυγάτηρ μὲν ἄτας* must have gone on with another predicate of *ἐγγύα* (*μάτηρ δὲ ζαμίας*, τίς τε δὲ ζαμίαν, or something of the sort). It follows that we may confidently restore *... ἐγγύα μὲν ἄτας, ἐγγύας δὲ ζαμία* as the real form of the verse: the only question is as to what preceded *ἐγγύα*. In the first foot the anapaest *θυγάτηρ* is probably inadmissible, as in Attic tetrameters; could *τίκνον* stand there as a trochee? Not in Aristophanes; but Epicharmus has such lengthenings: e.g. *λύχνος* and *μαῦρός* ('*Ελπίς* 2 and *Ηβ. γάμ.* 1) and *τὰ πρὸ τοῦ* ('*Ἀδελφ.* 27). *Τέκνον* may therefore be the missing word. But, of course, there are many other possibilities.

For the general form of the sentence compare fragment 44 of the '*Ἀδελφ.* (Lorenz).

A. *ἐκ μὲν θυσίας θοίνα* (!) *ἐκ δὲ θοίνας πόσις ἐγένετο*. B. *χαρίεν, ὥς γ' ἐμοὶ* (*δοκεῖ*). A. *ἐκ δὲ πόσιος κῶμος, ἐκ κόμου δ' ἐγένεθ'* *ἰανία, κ.τ.λ.*

*Teclides* enumerates in well-known lines the things of which the Athenians have made Pericles master (Meineke 2, 372: Kock 1, 220).

*πόλεων τε φόρους αὐτάς τε πόλεις τὰς μὲν δεῖν τὰς δ' ἀναλύνει,*  
*λίμνα τεῖχη τὰ μὲν οἰκοδομεῖν τὰ δὲ αὐτὰ πάλιν καταβάλλειν κ.τ.λ.*

Kock gives a long list of the changes proposed for *τὰ δὲ αὐτά*, none of which is satisfactory, and himself suggests *τὰ δὲ τᾶμ-πάλιν αὐτ.* Perhaps *τὰ δὲ πάντα* would do, the *πάντα* going of course closely with *καταβάλλειν*. The *μὲν* and *δέ* show that different fortifications are meant, but most of the changes ignore this. *Πάλιν* is *contrariwise*.

I have noticed two fragments of *Plato* where a slight change is needed to restore the poet's hand. We find in trochaic tetrameters (M. 2, 620: K. 1, 605)

*εἴασιν ἡμῖν οἱ νόμοι τοῦτοις τοῖσι λεπτοῖς ἀραχνίοις, ἂν τοῖσι τοῖχοις ἢ φάλαγξ ὑφαίνεται,*

But the second syllable of *ἀραχνίοις* is short, and Porson therefore wrote

*ἡμῖν οἱ νόμοι  
εἴασιν τοῦτοις τοῖσι λεπτοῖς ἀραχνίοις  
ἂν τοῖσι τοῖχοις ἢ φάλαγξ ὑφαίνεται,*

a somewhat violent alteration (but cf. *Xen. Mem.* 3, 11, 6), which Kock modifies into *εἴασιν ἡμῖν οἱ νόμοι | τοῦτοις τοῖσι λεπτοῖσιν ἀραχνίοισιν ᾧ | κ.τ.λ.*, while Meineke in his larger edition and Cobet (p. 61) seem content with the original reading. Meineke in the smaller edition and other scholars, too, have suggested *ἀραχνιδίοις*, and in the line of Cratinus, *ἀραχνίων μεστὴν ἔχεις τὴν γαστέρα*, they would read *ἀραχνιδίων*. This is ingenious and may be right, but I am inclined to think that after *λεπτοῖς* the article *τοῖς* was lost through similarity of letters. We thus get *τοῦτοις τοῖσι λεπτοῖς | <τοῖς> ἀραχνίοις ἂν τοῖσι τοῖχοις ἢ φάλαγξ ὑφαίνεται* without any further change of reading or metre. Against Porson I may appeal to an emendation of Porson's own (*Adversaria* p. 41) in which he put right

*ἰδὼν γὰρ αὐτὸν πρέσβυν οὐκ ἡνέσχετο  
μὴ οὐ τὸ λοιπὸν ἀνεσιν ἐν φθιτοῖς ἔχειν*

by writing *ἡνέσχετο <τὸ> μὴ οὐ*.

The other passage is a fragment of the *Hyperbolicus* (M. 2, 669: K. 1, 644)

*ἀλλ' ὅποτε μὲν χρεῖη 'δητώμην' λέγειν,  
ἔφασκε 'δητώμην,' ὅποτε δ' εἰπεῖν δεοὶ  
'ὀλίγον,' 'ὀλίον' ἔλεγεν.*

The rhythm of the last three words is so halting that we may surely put in an *ἂν* to help it, '*ὀλίγον,' 'ὀλίον' <ἂν> ἔλεγεν*.

It is very doubtful whether *Aristophanes* would use *βλέπω* with an accusative of a thing seen or looked at. This is a poetical use, and if it occurs once or twice in *Menander* we may remember that his Attic was said not to be of the very purest. When therefore we find in a fragment of the *Nῆσοι* (M. 2, 1109: K. 1, 493)

A. *τί σὺ λέγεις; εἰσὶν δὲ ποῦ;*  
B. *αἰδοῖ κατ' αὐτὴν ἣν βλέπεις τὴν εἰσοδόν,*

we are warranted in conjecturing *ἣ βλέπεις* or *ἣν βλέπης*.

A fragment of *Alexis* deals with the conditions of pleasure:

*οὐκ ἴστε ταῖς πλείστασι τῶν τεχνῶν ὅτι  
οὐκ ἀρχιτέκτων κύριος τῆς ἡδ. νῆς*

μόνος καθίστηκ', ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν χρωμένων  
συμβάλλεται τις, ἂν καλῶς χρῶνται, μερίς

(M. 3, 451: K. 2, 351).

Read οὐχ ἀρχιτέκτων with Bothe, but this is not all. Συμβάλλεται is not active in meaning, but passive with μερίς for its subject. He does not mean that some of the people contribute to their own pleasure: they all do. It is some of the pleasure, which is contributed by them. But then τῶν χρωμένων is left without construction, until we give it an ἐκ by turning καί to κακ.

A slight and obvious error in a line of Philemon's occurs in M. 4, 11: K. 2, 486

ἐμοῦ γάρ ἐστι κύριος μὲν εἰς ἀνὴρ,  
τούτων δὲ καὶ σοῦ μυρίων τ' ἄλλων νόμος,

where γάρ and μὲν should change places. Of course ἐμοῦ μὲν is contrasted with τούτων δέ, and μὲν is absurd where it stands. In a verse from Philemon's Παιδες will be found μετέχειν ἀνάγκη τῶν κακῶν γὰρ γίγνεται: which shows that we need not be afraid of putting γάρ late.

Less easy to put right is the fifth line of the following (M. 4, 22: K. 2, 496) which must be quoted at some length for the point to appear.

οἱ φιλόσοφοι ζητοῦσιν, ὡς ἀκήκοα,  
περὶ τοῦτό τ' αὐτοῖς πολὺς ἀναλοῦται χρόνος,  
τί ἐστιν ἀγαθόν, κοῦδ' εἰς εὐρηκέ πω  
τί ἐστιν. ἀρετὴν καὶ φρόνησιν φασὶ καὶ  
5 λέγουσι πάντα μᾶλλον ἢ τί τἀγαθόν.  
ἐν ἀγρῷ διατρίβων τὴν τε γῆν σκάπτων ἐγὼ  
νῦν ἡῶρον· εἰρήνη' στήν' ὦ Ζεῦ φίλτατε,  
τῆς ἐπαφροδίτου καὶ φιλανθρώπου θεοῦ.

The philosophers were always expounding τί τἀγαθόν, and therefore these words (line 5) cannot be right. What the speaker means is not that they do not profess to tell you τί τἀγαθόν, but that they have not really got hold of it. Their ἀγαθόν is not the true ἀγαθόν. In other words

λέγουσι πάντα μᾶλλον ἢ αὐτό τἀγαθόν.

Cf. Ar Eccles. 643 for the scansion. In line 3 we should probably read τί τἀγαθόν ἐστι; with Brunck.

My next emendation of Philemon is so obvious that it is a marvel no one has already made it:

τέθνηκεν υἱὸς ἡ μήτηρ τινί,  
ἢ νῆ Δι' ἄλλων τῶν ἀναγκαίων γέ τις

(M. 4, 34: K. 2, 505). Ἄλλων τῶν ἀναγκαίων τις is not grammar: read ἄλλος.

Turning to Menander, it is not hard to see that in the verse (M. 4, 141: K. 3, 71)

οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδέν, πάτερ, ἐν ἀνθρώπου φύσει  
μεῖζον λογισμοῦ τῷ διαθέσθαι πράγματα

we should read λογισμῷ τοῦ διαθέσθαι, i.e. τοῦ λογισμῷ διαθέσθαι. The speaker goes on to show that you can do anything and become anything τῷ λογίσασθαι. What possible construction is there for τῷ διαθέσθαι?

The beginning of another fragment (M. 4, 231: K. 3, 158)

εἴτ' οὐ δικαίως προσπεπατταλευμένον  
γράφουσι τὸν Προμηθεῖα πρὸς ταῖς πέτραις,

our ears tell us must be altered to

πρὸς ταῖς πέτραις γράφουσι τὸν Προμηθεῖα.

And in a third (M. 4, 234: K. 3, 161)

ὁ πάντα βουλῆθις ἂν ἄνθρωπος ποιεῖν  
πάντ' ἂν γένοιτο· πλούσιος τρόπον τινά,  
πάλιν φιλόσοφος τινι μαθήσει χρώμενος·  
τὸ σῶμ' ὑγιαίνει τινὰ δάιταρ προσφέρων,

the general connection shows that we must read ὑγιαίνει. The future is constantly parallel to the optative with ἂν.

In *Diphilus* a cook is addressing an auxiliary (M. 4, 394: K. 2, 553). He begins

οὐ μὴ παραλάβω σ' οὐδαμοῦ, Δράκων, ἐγὼ  
ἐπ' ἔργον οὐ μὴ διατελεῖς τὴν ἡμέραν  
τραπέζοιων ἐν ἀγαθοῖς πολλοῖς χυδῶν.

Παραλάβω may be right, but I rather suspect it should be παραβάλω. 'I will never risk you.' Cf. a fragment of Posidippus (M. 4, 521: K. 3, 343) line 14

ἂν δ' ἀλθινὸν  
σαντὸν παραβάλῃς, καὶ προσεκδαρεῖς ἄπει,

which is also the counsel of a cook. Οὐδαμοῦ might be changed to οὐδαμῶσε or οὐδ' μοί, but there is probably no need.

H. RICHARDS.

## ON HERODAS.

ONE of my objects in publishing these notes before my commentary appears is to invite assistance towards clearing up some passages that leave me still in doubt. They are but few; for I am satisfied now about the meaning of many things that puzzled all of us at first. The facsimile (I do not know whether mine is a particularly successful copy) has done me better service than I looked for—though I am well aware of the limited extent to which a photograph can be depended on. Mr. Kenyon with his ever-ready kindness has compared my readings with the original MS. and given me opinions which I shall indicate by the letter K. As I write, I have before me the third edition of Prof. Crusius' text, which has just been issued in a curtailed form to satisfy demand, the editor promising us a larger edition soon (on the plan of his *Babrius*) in which he will be able to give reasons for his corrections and supplements.

I. 32 τὴν Ἀιδεω κόρην, is an extraordinary phrase, unless it means 'the daughter of Hades': and who could that be? Hecate? τὴν κάτω κόρην I could understand.

38 καὶ σεν τὸ ὄριμον τέφρην κάψει. Crusius records a suggestion by Zielinski, τεφρὴν, understanding I suppose, τεφρὴν θρίξ, as though it were ἡ πολιά. But τέφρην does not here mean the ash of the funeral-pyre, but of decay, conceived as encroaching until it overlays and swallows up the living fuel. That this is the notion will be seen from Hom. *h. Herm.* 237, Callim. *h. Apoll.* 83, Euenos *A.P.* ix. 62, Lucret. iv. 926.

58 I can still find no support for οὐτε νεκρὸς οὐτ' ἐφ' ἡμέρην: ἐφ' ἡμέρην or ἐφ' ἡμέρης would be good.

82 At the end of the line I seemed to see in the facsimile ΕΛΛΑΠΔΑΝ (a result like Buecheler's): 'ΕΛΛΑΠΔΑΝ suits the MS., though the ε is hardly visible' K.

II. 8 The facsimile shows me CMENIH-ΔΞCTITHC which implies some form of δυσμένεια, e.g. ἐν δυσμενείῃ δ' ἐστὶ τῆς πόλιος. κήγῳ ('ΔΥ]CMENIHΔΞCTI suits the remains in the MS.' K.). Battaros is arguing with a cynical humour that he is as good as his opponent, if no better:

9 ζῶμεν οὐχ ὡς βουλόμεσθ' ἀλλ' ὡς ἡμεας ὁ καὶ πρὸς ἄλκειν προστάτην [νέμε]ι Μέννην ἐγὼ δ' Ἀριστοφ]ῶντα πνέξιν ἐνίκηκεν Μέννης· Ἀριστοφ]ῶν δὲ κῆτι νῦν ἀγχει.

In vv. 10-12 Crusius now gives what I have long felt sure must be the truth (except that he has ἐγὼ τ'), supporting ὁ καιρὸς (Stadtmueller) by v. 57 sqq. and Philostr. *Epist.* p. 229, 23 ἀγονοί...αὐτοὺς...οἱ καιροί. From a large amount of illustration I may refer here to Liban. *Epist.* 1567, Dem. 307 5, Ter. *Heaut.* 666. καιρὸς 'circumstances' = χρεία, τύχη, τὰ πράγματα, and ἄλκει = βιάζεται.

16-20 burlesque the Orators' habit of discounting anticipated pleas of service to the State:

16 λέξει [λό]γους μέ]ν· 'ἐξ Ἀκῆς ἐλήλουθα πυρ]οὺς ἀγων κήστησα τὴν κακὴν λιμὸν.' ἐγὼ δ]ὲ π ὀ ρ ν α ς ἐκ Τύρον· τί τῷ δήμῳ τοῦτ' ἐστί; δ]ωρεὴν γὰρ οὐθ' οὗτος πυροὺς δίδωσ' ἀλγ]θεὶν οὐτ' ἐγὼ καλὴν κινεῖν.

'πόρνας is probably right' K. The argument is 'He will plead, no doubt, that he has imported corn from Ake in time of scarcity; well, I have imported something else from Tyre; but his importation cannot be held an ἐπίδοσις τῷ δήμῳ any more than mine—he gets his price as much as I do.'

44. If the orifice of the clepsydra be not stopped, the water will escape too soon and leave no time to complete the argument: it is this which suggests to Battaros his coarse comparison:

μὴ π ρ ὀ σ θ ε κυσὸς φ < θ > ῆσι χῶ τάπης ἡμῖν.

τὸ τοῦ λόγου δὴ τοῦτο, λήτης κύρση.

i.e. μὴ φθῇ ἐπιφερομένη ἡ κοιλία, *ne prius venter profluat*, with disastrous results; cf. Lucret. iv. 1026 (where the *Babylonica* are the τάπης), Aesch. *Cho.* 753, Diphil. 72, schol. Ar. *Vesp.* 622.—μὴ πρόσθε as Eur. *Or.* 791.

46 ἐπὴν δ' ἐλευθερός τις αἰκίσῃ δοῦλῳ ἢ ἐκὼν ἐπίσπῃ

*aut sciens assectatus fuerit*, a translation into Ionic of ἐπακολουθήσῃ, as appears from the law cited by Aeschines *Timarch.* 139 'δοῦλον ἐλευθέρου παιδὸς μήτ' ἐρᾶν μήτ' ἐπακολουθεῖν, ἢ τύπτεσθαι τῇ δημοσίᾳ μάστιγι πενήνκοντα πληγὰς' κτέ.

50 ἦν θύρην δέ τις κόψη = θυροκοπήσῃ, one of the practices τῶν κομαζόντων, Ar. *Vesp.* 1253, Bekk. *Anec.* 42, 31. 99, 17. Ath. 618c, Ael. *N.A.* i. 50, Theocr. ii. 6, Dioscorid.

A.P. xii. 14, Hor. C. i. 25. 1, Appul. *de mag.* 75; which was a punishable offence at Athens, Antiphanes *fr.* 239.

72 τὸ αἰμ' ἂν ἐξεφύσησεν ὥσπερ Φίλιππος ἐν Σάμῳ κοτ' ὁ βρεῦκος. γελᾷς; κίναϊδός εἰμι, κτέ. The allusion is to the famous proverb (used by Diphilus and Philemon, Kock C.A.F. iii. p. 749) τὸν ἐν Σάμῳ κομήτην—a Samian boxer who, because he wore his hair long, was taunted by the competitors with effeminacy, and surprised them by winning the victory.<sup>1</sup> The name of his antagonist (uncertain here) is not elsewhere mentioned. By using this comparison Battaros identifies himself with the celebrated κομήτης, and it is this which raises the laugh, because κομήτης ordinarily implied κίναϊδος. Like a true βωμολόχος, he at once admits the imputation.

βρεῦκος or βροῦκος = ἀπτέλεβος, and I understand it is a term of contempt: cf. κεφαττελεβώδη ψυχὴν in Archestratus (Ath. 163d, 310d), A.P. xi. 265, Plaut. *Casina* 239, Phot. s.vv. κρέξ, τιγόνιον, Hesych. i. pp. 398, 400-3. 'Palaeographically your correction is very easy. Indeed I am not sure, that the copyist did not mean to write ΒΡΕΥΚΟΣ' K. This similarity of Υ and Γ caused the error of ΑΥΡΕΥ for ΑΓΡΕΥ in iii. 34, and (as I think) of ΑΝΔΥΑΘΝ for ΑΝΑΓΝΩΝ in viii. 7.

80 Aristaenet. i. 14, Plaut. *Poen.* 315, Timocles *fr.* 10, Theocr. xiv. 8.

III. 12 Kuehn on Pollux vii. 132 quotes from a glossary 'προῦνικος laciniosus.' Should not this be *lasciviosus*?

24 τριημέρη Μάρωνα γραμματίζοντος τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῷ τὸν Μάρων' ἐποίησεν οὗτος Σίμων' ὁ χρηστός.

Much good wit has been spent in attempting to discover the significance of these names. It has been rightly felt that they are not likely to have been used by Herodas without intention (like the hypothetical Δίων and Θέων of the Stoics). The clue I believe to lie in the suggestion of Dr. Rutherford that Σίμων was the name of a throw (βόλος) in gambling (Pollux vii. 204); and I think the point will be recovered if the reason of the boy's mistake is that Μάρων too was such another name. We shall see how probable this is. In Schol. Plat. *Lys.* 206 E = Eust. 1289. 57 we are told that the various πτώσεις ἀστραγάλων

were called after gods, heroes, kings, and other persons notable for good or evil. Now there were two Μάρωνες, both heroes, either of whom a throw might have been called after—one the popular figure, familiar from the epics, who gave Odysseus wine, the other a Lacedaemonian distinguished at Thermopylae (Hdt. vii. 27), who was honoured with a shrine in Sparta (Pausan. iii. 12. 9). This would be a good throw, while Σίμων we may suppose with Meineke would be a bad one.

29 δοκεῖσθ' ἀρωγὸν τῆς ἀωρίης ἔξειν. Heliod. i. 13, Quint. iii. 477, v. 446.

49 ὥστε μὴδ' ὀδόντα κινήσαι 'so that one doesn't even stir a tooth' means 'so that one gets nothing to eat' (Timocles *fr.* 10, σιαγόνας Liban. iv. 154. 1, Alexis 185. 3). The barrier of the teeth may check speech, but they are never the instruments of speaking—those are the lips or the tongue; they say γλῶτταν κινεῖν, *labra movere*, διὰ τὰ τὸ στόμα.

54 κοῦδ' ἵππος νιν αἰρεῖται is strange; ἵππος and other physical and mental affections are elsewhere said αἰρεῖν or λαμβάνειν. But I hardly think it is a mistake (as for αἰρεῖ τι or αἰρήσει), because Herodas seems purposely to use the middle in unusual ways, δείται vi. 41, θῶμαι viii. 9.

57 αἶδε. The Muses in the school-room we know from Ath. 348d, Diog. L. vi. 2. 69.

61 The meaning of τῇ Ἀκείσῳ σεληναῖῳ δείζοντες 'display him to the moon of A.' is still obscure to me.

88-93 How to divide this passage among the speakers is the most baffling thing in Herodas where the words are legible: if any one will solve it for me I shall indeed be grateful. The foundations I would build upon are these: It is Lampriskos who is inclined to be merciful, not Metrotime (87); it must therefore be Metrotime who insists (91) on twenty more lashes however well the boy may be going to read his book; and that remark must be a reply to a suggestion of Lampriskos that if he does his book he need receive no more. But now begin the difficulties: ἔδρης ποικιλωτέρως cannot mean anything else but 'more cunning' or 'unmanageable': the ἀλλά that begins the line might express either an objection, 'But...' or a reluctant assent, 'Well, he is...'; but it will be found that upon either view we stumble. It has been suggested to me that a deprecatory answer by Lampriskos has been lost after v. 88: unless this is so, the only way I can divide the lines intelligibly is as follows

<sup>1</sup> A story the same in its essential points is told by Phaedrus, *Append.* viii.

M. δαῖρον δ' Ἀ. ἄχρῃς ἥλιος δόγη;<sup>1</sup>  
 M. ἀλλ' ἔστων ὕδρης ποικιλότερος πολλῶ,  
 καὶ δεῖ λαβεῖν νιν Ἀ. καπὶ βυβλίῳ δόγκου  
 τὸ μῆθέν M. ἀλλας εἰκοσὶν γε, κῆν  
 μέλλῃ  
 αὐτῆς ἄμεινον τῆς Κλεοῦς ἀναγνώναι.

It is in favour of combining δόγκου τὸ μῆθέν that δόγκου is habitually added to excuse οὐδεὶς or πᾶς (as in v. 24 δόγκου πάντα). The interpretation 'at the least,' 'as a mere nothing' has no support in Greek: they say τούλάχιστον. 'The good-for-nothing' would be τὸν μῆθέν (Soph. *El.* 1161, *A.P.* xi. 364).

IV. 12 οἰκίης τοίχων κήρυκα as a phrase is no stranger than ὄρνεις οἰκίης Babrius 17. 1; and τοίχων is not idle, for we learn from *Geopon.* *Script.* xiv. 7, p. 985n. that the roosts were made upon the walls, and also that αἶραι (vi. 100) were good poultry-food.

17 ἀπέψῃσας I take to be substituted by Herodas for the technical ἀπέμαξας: this use of unfamiliar synonyms is part of his method; in iii. 93 for example πλύντας means no more than βάψας or βρέξας.

44 ὀρεῖσα καρκίνον μέζον Xen. *Sympr.* v. 5, Ath. 339a. μέζον as Hom. *Y* 342, Straton 1. 5 (iii. p. 361 Kock) προσβλέψας μέγα.

47 I take the reading to be πανταχῇ δ' ἴσον κῆσαι 'but everywhere you are rated (or 'set down') at the same value': Aristid. ii. 127 ἦν ἂν πλείστον θῆς... Alexis 15. 13 τὸ τάριχος τέθεικας διπλασίον 'put it down at double'. Philostr. *V.S.* ii. 21 ἐν σπανιστοῖς ἔκειτο 'was counted a rarity.' Mr. Kenyon, however, says 'Y is not impossible, but there is hardly room enough for O; moreover the letter after C has too upright a stroke to suit O well. I don't say that ΙCOY is impossible, but I can't satisfy myself about the OY.' The Δ is quite clear, and necessary in any case.

63 ἦν ἴδῃσι Μύλλος?

69 εἰ μὴ ἐδόκευ τι μέζον...πρήσσειν would mean 'if it were not that I think I am doing...', as Soph. *O.T.* 402 εἰ δὲ μὴ 'δόκει γέρον εἶναι. Correct grammar surely requires εἰ μὴ ἐδόκευ ἂν<sup>2</sup> μέζον...πρήσσειν 'were it not that I think I should be doing...'. The τι is certainly not necessary, for μέγα ποιεῖν

<sup>1</sup> A phrase derived perhaps from Hom. *A* 192=207 =P 453.

<sup>2</sup> It is well known that nothing is commoner in MSS. than confusion of tenses and omission of ἂν with δοκᾶ: in Lucian ii. 205 read δοκεῖτε δέ μοι ἄριστ' ἂν βαυλεύεσθαι as Isocr. xvii. 56 or δοκεῖτε δ' ἂν μοι as Dem. 342, 12.

(Lucian iii. 312, Plut. *Mor.* 233 A) is as good as μέγα λέγειν.

μέζον ἢ γυνή (as the first hand in vi. 34) I have not found elsewhere. Usual expressions are μεῖζον ἢ γυναῖκα χρή, ἢ κατ' ἀνθρώπον,<sup>3</sup> ἢ χρεῶν or ἢ δίκῃ, or with the genitive μεῖζον οἰκέτον 'too much for...'

73 οὐδ' ἐρεῖς 'κείνος ἄνθρωπος ἐν μιν εἶδεν ἐν δ' ἀπηρνθή', ἀλλ'... This curious phrase is confirmed and explained by Himerius *Or.* xiv. 23, eulogising the attainments of Hermogenes: τριχῇ δὲ τῆς πάσης φιλοσοφίας νενεμημένος, καὶ τῆς μὲν εἰς τὰς πράξεις, τῆς δὲ περὶ τὴν φύσιν, τὴν δὲ τὰ ὑπὲρ οὐρανὸν ζητούσης τε καὶ πραγματευομένης, οὐ τῇ ν μὲν εἶδε τῆς δὲ ἡμέλῃσε εἰ τὴν δὲ ὡς ἀχρηστον πρὸς χρῆσιν εὐδαίμονος ἡ τέμασεν, ἀλλὰ πάσαις, δοῦς ἑαυτὸν οὕτως πάσας ἐκτέτατο ὥς οὐδεὶς ἕτερος μίαν τινὰ κτήσασθαι περὶ πολλοῦ ποιησάμενος. The meaning therefore appears to be 'you cannot say that he regarded one department with favour and renounced, disdained, another...' This sense of εἶδεν can be amply illustrated. Himerius is devoted to poetical language and often expresses regret that he is not himself a poet.

94 τῆς ὑγίης μοι πρόσδος· ἢ γὰρ ἰροῖσιν μέζον ἁμαρτεῖν (1) ἢ ὑγίη· στί τῆς μοίρης.

I am persuaded that these lines belong to the νεωκόρος. They are entirely in keeping with his character, portrayed already with definite and effective strokes. Long before, Aristophanes had ventured to describe the priest as appropriating the offerings, *Plut.* 676-681; and in the *Pax* a χρησμολόγος (1047), who has been attracted by the smell of the sacrifice, begs for a share, 1105 ἐγχει δὴ κάμοι καὶ σπλάγχνων μοῖραν ὄρεξον, 1111 οὐδεὶς προσδώσει μοι σπλάγχνων; and is reviled for a τίνθης and ἀλάζων. There is a similar scene in *An.* 959-984. Placed in the mouth of the νεωκόρος, therefore, this request completes the delineation of an existing type, and affords to my mind by far the most satisfactory conclusion.

The palaeographical transition is easy from MOI to ΛΩI' K. Cf. the writing of MOI in vii. 102.

The meaning of πρόσδος is not 'add' but 'bestow,' *impertire*: as ὁ ἐπαίτων says 'ἐπίδος,' so ὁ προσαίτων says 'πρόσδος': Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 29 προσαίτειν ὥσπερ τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἱκετεύοντα καὶ δεόμενον προσδοῖναι. The word is very inadequately treated by the Lexicons.

<sup>3</sup> This should be read in Hdt. viii. 38: cf. Xen. *Cyr.* i. 1. 6, Soph. *O.T.* 740, Plat. *Legg.* 795 C.



For AMAPTINC Buecheler reads ἀμαρτεῖν<sup>1</sup> 'accompanying': I conjecture AMΔPTIN, 'for at sacrifices the health-cake is a more serious thing to lose than one's portion,' the construction as Soph. *Ant.* 439, 637, *El.* 1015.

V. 4 Ἀμφυταίη [τῇ Μένωνος ἔγκειται; Γ. ἐγὼ Ἀμφυταίη; τὴν λέγεις ὁρώρηκα γυναῖκα; is, I think, a certain correction by Dr. Jackson. This elliptical form of exclamation is common both in verse and prose.<sup>1</sup> An excellent illustration of this form of denial on the part of a detected slave is supplied by Galen ii. p. 66 Kuehn.

53 οὐ δ' ἐπεμνήσθην should perhaps be ἐπεμνήσθην: that at any rate is the meaning here, as *Erot. Script.* p. 623 Hirschig bene mihi venit in mentem:—vade puer. ἐπεμνήσθην is right in VI. 42 where the meaning is memoravi.

66 μὴ ὁδῶ una opera 'at one job' I know only in Eur. *Hel.* 764: τῆς αὐτῆς ὁδοῦ is common.

69 νῦν μὲν αὐτὸν...ἄφες, παραιτεῖμαι σε τὴν μίαν ταύτην ἀμαρτίην—'overlook,' I think she was going to say, but is interrupted, 'and punish him next time,' the same appeal that Pyrrhies has made before (26–28) and that is often made elsewhere, as Ter. *Eun.* 852, Plaut. *Mil.* 565, Ov. *Amor.* ii. 14. 43. Because you can say ἐν or τοῦτο παραιτοῦμαι σε, it does not follow that παραιτεῖμαι σε τὴν ἀμαρτίην is Greek.

77 οὐ τὴν τύραννον. *Hera*, I incline to think. She shares the rank of Zeus (Ζήνα τύραννον Ar. *Nub.* 563); and as Pericles was called τύραννος, being another Zeus, so Aspasia was called Ἥρα and τύραννος (Cratin. 240, 241 Kock, cf. Eupol. 403). If Bitinna does mean Hera, she appeals to her as the powerful champion of women's rights: cf. Eur. *I.A.* 738, *Andr.* 912; where by τὴν ἀνασσαν the women mean, I doubt not, Ἥραν ζυγίαν, τελείαν.

80 ἄλλ' ἔστιν εἰκὸς καὶ Γερῆνι' ἐς πέμπτην. The 20th is already a holiday, and there is another coming on the 25th—a day of offerings to the dead, as is plain from v. 82. Since we know nothing of any such Γερῆνια, I may suggest that it is an error for καὶ Ἀγρίνι, an Ionicised form of Ἀγρίνια, which is recorded by Hesychius to have been νεκύσια παρὰ Ἀργείοις. There was a Coan month Ἀγρίνιος (Paton, *Inscriptions*

of Cos, pp. 326–334) in which we have record of two offerings to the dead: (1) *Inscript. of Cos*, 35, p. 64 to King Nicomedes; (2) to the great Hippocrates, who was born according to Soranus of Cos on the 27th or 26th of that month: Westermann *Biog.* p. 449 γεννηθεῖς...ὡς Σωρανὸς ὁ Κῶος ἐρευνήσας τὰ ἐν Κῷ γραμματοφυλακείᾳ προστίθισι, μοναρχοῦντος Ἀβριάδα, μηνὸς Ἀγριαν<ι>ον κζ'. παρ' ὃ καὶ ἐναγίζεν ἐν αὐτῇ μέχρι νῦν Ἰπποκράτει φησὶ τοὺς Κῶους.

'For the present, then,' says Bitinna, 'I will let you off';

ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῖς καμοῦσιν ἐχγυτλώσωμεν ἄξεις τότ' ἀμελιτῖτιν ἑορτὴν ἐξ ἑορτῆς.

'but when we have poured out our offerings to the dead, you shall keep then feast after feast of a very different kind,' ἀμελιτῖτιν i.e. πικράν, because in offerings to the dead honey was the most prominent item: might not such a ceremony be called μελιτῖτις ἑορτή? Cf. Menand. 521 ἔκτην ἐπὶ δέκα Βοηδρομιῶνος ἐνδελεχῶς ἄξεις δέι (a day when wine flowed), Ath. 99 e μὴ καὶ τινα Κυνοφόντιν ἑορτὴν ποιησώμεθα...Ar. *Nub.* 621 ἀποστῖαν ἄγειν, Plaut. *Capt.* 468 *esurialis ferias*—but I think my conjecture better than ἄξεις τότ' ἀμέλει νῆστιν or λιπὸν ἑορτὴν, though ἀμέλει would be good enough.

VI. 12 'The remains suit ΤΑΥΤΟΜΟΙ better than ΤΑΥΤΕΜΟΙ' K., but ταῦτ' ἐμοὶ is as necessary a correction as in Eur. *Bacch.* 182 ταῦτ' ἐμοὶ πάσχεις ἄρα· κἀγὼ γὰρ...(L. Dindorf for ταῖτό μοι): *I.T.* 646, *Cycl.* 108, 630, Ar. *Eccl.* 339, *Vesp.* 10, Aesch. *Cho.* 541.

14 It is strange if ταῖς ἀνωνύμοις ταῖτας is governed by ἐπιβρύχουσα and not by ἱλακτέω: but with ἱλακτέω I require τὰς ἀνωνύμοις ταῖτας.

19 βαυβῶνα: in the corrupted Orphic fragment (p. 241 Abel) I suggest παῖς δ' ἦ ὅ τ', Ἰαχχος χεῖρ' ἱταμὴν ρίπτασκε (this with Herwerden), or παῖς δ' οἶον, as Alcman 38 μαργὸς δ' Ἔρως οἶα παῖς παῖσδε.

63 κατ' οἰκίην δ' ἐργάζετ', ἐμπολέων λάθρη 'does business at home' and not in the market: κατ' ἀγόραν ἐργάζομαι says a cook in Poseidipp. Com. 23 iii. 342 Kock (Ath. 659 c), with which compare Plaut. *Pseud.* 790–809.

98 τὴν θύρην κλείσον  
αὕτη σὺ, νεοσσοπῶλι, κἀξαμύθηρσαι

<sup>2</sup> I should be glad if any similar names for ceremonies besides Alciph. iii. 46 ἦγε τὴν Κουρεῶν ἡμέραν, ἀλῆτις ὥδή, ἀγιάτιδες θεραπείαι, ἀγὼν στεφανίτης, ἀμφορίτης.

<sup>1</sup> In Aeschines *Klesiph.* 167 p. 77. 30 read ἡλεγε, ὡς ἀντιγράφων Ἀλεξάνδρῳ· ὁμολογῶ Θεττάλους καὶ Περίβαιβους ἀφιστάναι. σὺ Θεττάλους; σὺ γὰρ ἂν κώμην ἀποστήσεις; where after σὺ Θεττάλους the MSS. have ἀφιστάναι or ἀποστήσεις or ἀφιστήσεις, all interpolations.

αἱ ἀλεκτορίδες εἰ σόαι εἰσὶ τῶν τ' αἰρέων  
αὐτῆσι ῥίψον· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλὰ πορθεῖσι  
ὀρνιθοκλῆπται κῆν τρέφῃ τις ἐν κόλπῳ.

99 νεοσσοῦλι Diels. 100 Crusius.

As in Opp. *Hal.* iv. 395 a shepherd  
πεμπάζεται οἶων πληθύνει διέπων εἰ οἱ σόα  
πάντα πέλονται, so the chickens are to be  
counted to see that none has been carried  
off, 'for the bird-stealers will plunder out  
of one's very lap'—a remark that hints  
bitterly at the loss of her other cherished  
property. Lucian i. 93 κίσσαν μου, λάλον  
ὄρειον, ἐκ μέσων ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν τῶν  
κόλπων ἀρπάσας κίτταν ὠνόμασεν com-  
plaints Σῆγμα of Ταῖ, birds like other pets  
being often kept by women ἐν κόλποις, *in*  
*sinu*. 'ΩΡΝΙΘΟΚΛΕΠΤΑΙ suits the MS.  
The space for the ΠΤ is rather wide, but  
not I think too much so.' K. I know at  
least half-a-dozen other compounds of  
κλέπτῃς.

VII. 3 οὐ μάτην, Μητροῖ, ἐγὼ φιλέω σε  
*merito te amo: bene facis* Ter. *Eun.* 186,  
*Adelph.* 945, *Heaut.* 360.

19 τὴν (σ)αμβαλουχὴν is a form to which  
I know no parallel. Substantives in -δόκη  
or -δόχη (Lobeck *Phryg.* 307, Cobet *V.L.*  
579) are numerous; and we have ἡ οἰνοχόη,  
πλημοχόη, τυμβοχόη, δελυάβη: but ὁ λυ-  
νοῦχος, τρυπανοῦχος, κυν-, μυλ-, πυργ-. In  
v. 53 τὰς αμβαλουχίδας supports αἶγες  
κερουχίδες in Theocr. v. 145; I cannot say  
whether that form is required in v. 19.

25 οὕτως ἔμ[υ ἢ τύχη] δόλῃ  
καλῶν οἱ ἐσθλῶν ὄσων[π]ερ ἱκανῶσθ'  
ἐπανρέσθαι.

Here ἡ τύχη (cf. 88, 93) is a synonym of οἱ  
θεοί, who are the regular agents in such  
blessings: Hom. ζ 180, θ 413, ω 402, η 148,  
Eur. *Andr.* 740, *Hel.* 1407, Antiphan. 163,  
Alexis 95, Hor. *Sat.* ii. 8. 75, Plaut. *Epidic.*  
6, *Pers.* 483. Heliod. v. 11 σοὶ δ' ἀντὶ  
τούτων οἱ θεοὶ τοσαῦτα δοῖεν ὅσα κατὰ γνώμην  
ὄντα τὴν σὴν (τυγχάνει;) εἰς κόρον τελεσθῆναι.

28 κοῖδὲ κηρὸς ἀνθήσει...

Buecheler takes κηρὸς to be the hyperbole  
of whiteness; but ὑποδήματα so described  
would be distinct, I suspect, from λευκά: cf.  
Vopiscus *Aurelianus*. 49 *calceos mulleos et*  
*cereos et albos et edereceos viris omnibus*  
*<abs>tulit, mulieribus reliquit*. But a phrase  
of Manetho induces me to think the κηρὸς  
here meant is the medium in κρηρογραφία—  
the painter's palette, as we should say: ἐν

γραφίους μελιηδέος ἄνθεσι κηροῦ δεικνύντας  
πάντων μορφᾶς θηρῶν τε καὶ ἀνδρῶν is  
Manetho's paraphrase of ζωγράφους p. 14  
Koechly v. 324. Euseb. *Vit. Const.* i. 3  
κηροχίτον γραφῆς ἀνθεσιν.

40-43 are difficult, but ought to be  
restorable; the shoemaker is growing queru-  
lous, and the nature of his complaints may  
be inferred from the following passages:  
Plat. *Axiach.* 368 B τοὺς χειρωνακτικοὺς  
ἐπέλθωμεν καὶ βαναύσους ποιομένους ἐκ νυκτὸς  
εἰς νύκτα καὶ μόλις ποριζομένους τάπιτῆδεια,  
κατοδυρομένων τε αὐτῶν καὶ πᾶσαν ἀγρυπ-  
νίαν ἀναπιμπλάντων ὀλοφυρμῶν καὶ δακρῶν.  
Liban. ii. 75. 3 οἱ μὲν δὴ χειροτέχναι  
... ἀγρυπνοῦ. Lucian i. 642 οὐκέτι  
... ἔωθεν εἰς ἐσπέραν ἄσιτος δια-  
μενῶ, οὐδὲ τοῦ χειμῶνος ἀνυπόδητος τε καὶ  
ἡμέγυμνος περιουσιῶσιν τοὺς ὁδόντας ὑπὸ τοῦ  
κρύους συγκροτῶν, ii. 702 (where the shoemaker  
—type of the poor artisan—is waked from  
his dreams of wealth by the crowing cock)  
'it is not yet midnight, to judge τῇ ἡσυχίᾳ  
πολλῇ ἐτι οὔσῃ καὶ τῷ κρύει μηδέπω με τὸ  
ὄρθριον ὥσπερ εἴωθεν ἀποπηνήνντι—γνώμων  
γὰρ οὗτος ἀψευδέστατός μοι προσελαυνούσης  
ἡμέρας.

I suggest therefore that the shape of the  
sentences was this:

INΔAN...ΕΩΝ νύκτα κῆμερ ἐν θάλπῳ  
(κ)οῖδεν τι]ς ἡμέων ἀχρεῖς ἐσπέρης κάπτει  
χῶσαι βο]αὶ πρὸς ὄρθρον· οὐ δοκέω τόσσον  
τὰ Μικίωνος θηρὶ εὐπ[ορεῖν φωνῆς.

The puzzle is to find an object for θάλπω:  
one expects the *sedentarius sutor* to protest  
'I keep my seat warm night and day.'  
Here again help would be gratefully  
received.

46 οἱ κῆν ἦν Ζεὺς τοῦτο μοῦ[νον] ἀδοῦσι  
'φέρ' εἰ φέρεις τι' τᾶλλα δ' ἀ[ψόφως]  
ῆνται,  
ὅπως νεοσσοὶ τὰς κοχῶνας θάλποντες.

τᾶλλα δὲ is necessary; and by ἀψόφως I  
understand that except when they are  
*clamouring* for food, they sit snug and silent:  
cf. Apoll. Rhod. ii. 1083 *as when Zeus hails*  
*upon the houses, the dwellers—if they have a*  
*sound roof—κόναβον τεγέων ὑπὲρ εἰσαίοντες*  
*ῆνται ἀκήν*, 'ἀψόφως is perhaps possible,  
but the tail of a long letter following α is  
rather far for the ψ and rather near for the  
φ' K. So that the true word may perhaps  
be ἀσφαλέως.

57 Perhaps Νεοσσοῖς, Χίαι (ΧΕΙΑΙ) for  
Λεῖαι: see Schmidt *Hesych.* iv. p. 286.

79 I am not yet satisfied as to the meaning of the sums mentioned in *vv.* 79, 99, 102, 106, 122. The ordinary price of shoes was about 2 drachms, Lucian *iii.* 297, 319, 320. Liban. *ii.* 217. 21 'Did anyone ever expect those who teach *εἰς τάχος γράφειν* to see gold ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῶν τέχνης, ἢ βέλτιον πράξειν τῶν σκυτοτόμων καὶ τεκτόνων; οὐδείς.'

106 καὶ ταῦτ'] ἐ]πτά [δα]ρεικῶν.

The facsimile shows me ΠΤΔ 'I think I should print it as Ε]ΠΤΑΔΔΡΙΚΩΝ' K. Perhaps καὶ ταῦτ' οὐκ λάβ'

107-112 are not yet solved by the ingenious conjectures of Crusius and Buecheler, though they are probably on the right track. In *v.* 107 the letter following THCΔ appears to have been A, and there are other remnants. In 108 I agree with Blass that there is not room for δν]ναιτο, and Δ would have left traces. In 110 Buecheler's conjecture *ἔχεις γὰρ οὐχὶ γλάσσαν ἡδονῆς δ' ἡθμόν* gives what must have been the form of the sentence, but I do not feel sure that ἡθμόν would convey 'unde liquida voluptas defuit.' *ἐκ τετρημένης ἡβῇ* (which he compares) in *iii.* 33 means a slow, stammering utterance, cf. *eliqut* Pers. *i.* 34, Appul. *Flor.* *ii.* 5: Plaut. *Poen.* 513 *iste quidem gradus succretust cribro pollinario* (so slow it is).

The MS. has perhaps HΘMIN, but the penultimate letter was not O. I suggest therefore ἰθμῆν (Ebeling *Lex. Hom. s.v. ἰσιθμῆ*, Lob. *Parall.* 395), but I have not recorded any similar expression.

VIII. 1-10 cf. Auson. *Ephemeris* 1-20, p. 1216 Weber.

7 καὶ τὴν ἀναγνον χοῖρον for ἀναυλον which could only mean 'homeless' or 'shelterless.' I understand ἀναγνον here merely as a term of abuse, equivalent to *μιαρόν, ἐναγῆ, ἀκάθαρτον* 'polluted with blood.' That is the proper meaning of these words, and it is always implied by ἀναγνος (a word corrupted in Soph. *O.C.* 945 and schol. Aesch. *Theb.* 843).

15 ἀκουσον, οὐ [γὰρ ἡλεὰς] φρένας βόσκεις  
τράγον τιν' [ἐκ] φάραγγος οἴσθην  
μακρῆς ὁ[ροῦσαι] σύ]ν τε κείκερως [αἴγας].

#### CHOLIAMBIC FRAGMENTS.

A phrase describing the salamander is thrice quoted in Cramer's *Anecd.* *ii.* 371, 480, 483: Ζῷον ἐν πυρὶ σκαῖρον. I do not doubt it is from a choliambic writer, perhaps Aischrion.

Another phrase in *ii.* 480 "Ἦν νύκτες χαρίζονται: νυκτεριναὶ σωματίων συνουσίαι I take to be choliambic, probably from the same source; e.g. ἦν χ. νύκτες or νύκτες ἦ χ. The natural substantive would be *τέρψιν*, as *ἐννυχίαν τέρψιν* in Soph. *Aj.* 1203, Antimach. *A.P.* *ix.* 321 *ἀ κατ' εὐνὰν τέρψις*.

Collections of proverbs no doubt include many quotations originally choliambic; among which I reckon 'Αεὶ με τοιοῦτοι πολέμοιο δώκοιεν (reading τοῖοι), probably from a fable.

W. HEADLAM.

King's College, Cambridge.

#### NOTES ON LATIN ORTHOGRAPHY.

(Continued from p. 119.)

##### ASSIMILATION IN PREPOSITIONAL COMPOUNDS.

The question of the assimilation of prepositions is touched upon but briefly in the Report, which points out the want of uniformity in the spelling of the same words even on the same inscription, as *conlegium* and *collegium*, *impensa* and *impensarum* on the Monumentum Ancyranum. But school text-books must inevitably give the precedence to one or the other spelling of a given word, and, even were the preponderance of the evidence for the one over that for the

other but slight, it would be worthy of consideration. And as a matter of fact the words for which there are not grounds for a decided preference of one spelling are not numerous. So the variation *conlegium*, *collegium* on the Mon. Ancyranum is only another example of the transitional character of its spelling. For, as pointed out by Mommsen, *Eph. Ep.* *i.* p. 79, *collegium*, which occurs for the first time in the Augustan period beside the older *conlegium*, is the spelling of all the numerous examples of the word in the Acta Arvalia from Tiberius on, except for the revival of the older spelling under Claudius

and in one section of the acts under Nero (Jan. 3—March 4, A.D. 59), the writer of which affected the spelling of Claudius to the extent of using his invention, the inverted F for v. Certainly there can be no question that we should prefer *collegium*.

The difficulty begins when one attempts to state general laws for all compounds in which the combination of final and initial consonant is the same. For we must not fail to recognize what the grammarians did not suspect, namely that the presence or absence of assimilation in prepositional compounds is not merely a matter of phonetic law, but that the psychological element, the influence of the normal form of the preposition is a most important factor. If, for example, *conligo*, *conloco*, etc., remain unassimilated throughout the period of the republic, it is not because the assimilation of *nl* to *ll* as a phonetic process was not yet operative. For this change, as seen in *corolla* beside *corona*,<sup>1</sup> *suillus* beside *suinus*, far antedates our earliest historical records. It is rather that this phonetic process is held in check by the analogical influence of the *con-* which is the normal form in compounds. And again, if the *conlegium* of the republic is supplanted by *collegium* in the Augustan period, it need not surprise us to find that in other words such as *conloco*, *conloquium*, *inlustris* the change to the assimilated form was centuries later. The consciousness of composition and the association with the separate elements may be much stronger in one word than in another. This is a linguistic phenomenon too well known to need elaborate treatment; we may however recall an illustration from our own language in the matter of the vowel change seen in the first part of compounds. We say *husband* without thought of the connection with *house*, and once said *huswife*, but this, except in the degenerate *hussy*, has been replaced by *housewife*; similarly *shepherd* but *sheepfold*.

The lack of uniformity in the treatment of the same combination of consonants is evident enough in the case of words whose spelling is not a matter of doubt. For example the regular assimilation of *rl* to *ll* (*agellus* from \**agerlos*, etc.) is followed in *polliceor*, *polluo* etc., the *por* not being used separately, and only in a few compounds. So *intellego* is the proper spelling from the earliest times, the connection with *inter* not being felt, but all other such compounds as *interlino*, *interloquor* etc., remain unassimi-

lated in all periods. In some compounds of *per-*, notably *perlego* (*perligo*), *pellego* (*pelligo*), both forms were in use. It is obvious then that in the investigation of contested spellings each word must be taken by itself, and a general rule set up only when it is warranted by the actual occurrences. And yet there is more uniformity than one would expect if the degree of consciousness of composition were the only factor involved, and we may wonder if there are not some other minor factors influencing the unconscious choice between the phonetic, assimilated forms on the one hand and the analogical, unassimilated forms on the other. So in the spelling of the republican period there is absolute uniformity among all compounds of *con-l* in favour of the unassimilated form, while among compounds of *ad-c-* the assimilated form is universally employed. May not this be due to the fact that *nl*, though subject to assimilation in the normal phonetic development, may be pronounced without the slightest difficulty while *dc* requires a distinct effort? It is conceivable that the accent should be of some influence, but in spite of the suggestion of Dorsch, Assimilation in den compositis bei Plautus und Terentius p. 47, the facts do not make this clear.

The following pages are devoted to the consideration of the spelling of compounds in *ad-f-*, *ad-s-*, *ad-n-*, *ad-l-*, *ad-r-*, *con-l-*, *con-r-*, *in-l-*, *in-r-*, in which we find the greatest variation both in the prescripts of the grammarians and in the actual practice of the present time. Some of our most recent schoolbooks prefer the unassimilated spelling, but commonly both here and abroad the assimilated forms are used. This latter procedure, so far as it is anything more than conservatism in the retention of our traditional spelling, is due to the conviction that, however common the unassimilated spelling may be, the consonants were assimilated in actual pronunciation. So Bennett, Appendix p. 78: "On the whole there seems very little to commend the employment of the etymological spelling. If we take it as intended to indicate pronunciation, we can hardly reject the express statement of the grammarians that such pronunciation was wrong. If, on the other hand, we regard the etymological spelling as purely graphical, there seems no advantage in writing *adl*, *adg*, *inr*, *inl*, etc., when *all*, *agg*, *irr*, *ill* were actually spoken, especially since the Romans themselves often indicated the assimilation." Similarly Seelmann, *Aussprache des Lateins* p. 61 f., states that assimilated

<sup>1</sup> It will be understood that quantity is not marked in this paper, which has to do mainly with questions of actual spelling.



forms are the older and that the unassimilated forms arose by recombination in a later period and never came to represent the best pronunciation. He therefore ridicules the practice of introducing these latter as the "proper" forms in our modern texts. But Seelmann's whole discussion labours under the mistake of too much generalization. If, as is so often emphasized nowadays, the old idea that the assimilated forms are later than the unassimilated was a mistaken one, the opposite view if taken generally is equally incorrect. Seelmann's view is undoubtedly correct for a word like *accipio*. This is the only spelling known in the republican period, and certainly by far more common even later, so that the cases of *adccipio* are to be attributed to the craze for etymological writing, and not to any change in the actual pronunciation unless possibly in the speech of some would-be reformers. So in our English *cupboard* (in early English sometimes *cubbord*) the knowledge of the etymology has affected the spelling but not the pronunciation. This is especially true of words with a combination of surd mutes, though strictly each word must be studied by itself as there is great difference in the relative frequency of the two spellings. But in the combinations we are considering especially (*adf*, *ads*, *conl* etc.), the case is absolutely different. For the great majority of words of this sort the assimilated forms are wholly unknown in the republican period in which the spelling was more strictly phonetic than later (cf. *opseruare*, etc.). Here then it is distinctly the case that the assimilated forms are the later. How much later? If they had supplanted others in the first century A.D. as *collegium* did *conlegium*, we should certainly employ them. And if they are found at this time with considerable frequency, even though less common than the unassimilated spelling, this would be enough to establish the assimilated pronunciation and so furnish some grounds for preferring the assimilated spelling. But what if the assimilated spelling is unknown in the first century A.D., or even almost or wholly unknown in the first six centuries (cf. *inlustris* below)? For such words there could hardly be any question as to the spelling to be adopted, nor as to the pronunciation, for the assimilated pronunciation would betray itself.

It is essential then to have before us as completely as possible the facts regarding the spelling of each word, and to obtain these requires considerable labour. The

statements in the grammars of Lindsay and Stolz are too vague to be of use. Lindsay for example gives *affero*, *illudo* and *inludo*, *colloco* and *conloco* without any indication as to the age of the assimilated forms (cf. *adfero* below; *affero* I have not met with on inscriptions, or, so far as I have looked, in MSS. of the first six centuries). Brambach, *Neugestaltung*, in general prefers the unassimilated forms, as the more frequent on inscriptions, but one is not sure from his casual citations just how strong the case is. The indices of the Latin Corpus faithfully register the unassimilated forms *adsigno*, etc., as they do *adccipio* etc., and an extensive collection of such examples may be found in Neue's *Formenlehre* under the various prepositions. But what proportion of the total number of occurrences do these unassimilated forms represent? Is *assigno* still more common than *adsigno*, as is the case with *accipio* beside *adccipio*, or is it simply less common, or is it wholly unknown in inscriptions of a good date? After one has met several dozen instances of *adsigno* one becomes more interested in a possible *assigno* and wishes the indices were better designed to aid in the search for such a form. Nothing can be concluded from the silence of the indices or of Neue's collections, since no account is taken of *accipio* beside *adccipio*. Our traditional orthography is taken as the normal, and only variations from it are noted, though in many cases it is really this traditional spelling which would be noteworthy. The only treatise in which both sides of the evidence are presented is Dorsch, *Assimilation in den Compositis bei Plautus und Terentius* (*Prager Philologische Studien* I), which is the best thing that has been written on the subject. But the author, being concerned with the proper spelling of the time of Plautus, uses the evidence of inscriptions only from the republican period. In order to gain any notion of the relative frequency and the dates of the spellings it seemed necessary to read over a considerable mass of inscriptions, and accordingly I have glanced through a large part of the *Corpus*, namely i, ii, iii, 2, iv, v, 2, vi, 2, 3, 4, viii, 2, ix, x, 2, xi, xii, xiv, and some other collections. It is altogether likely that in such a hasty examination not a few instances have been overlooked, but I doubt if a more exact count would materially change the result. For example I should not wish to assert absolutely that no example of *ill* for *inl* exists in the whole *Corpus*, but it is certainly significant enough that in noting



over sixty examples of *inl* no instance of *ill* has been noticed. In the case of words of frequent occurrence only the total results will be given, though I have the references on file. As there is no MS. evidence for the first century (except the Herculean papyri), I had not intended to consider the MSS., but finding that on inscriptions the spelling varies less than was anticipated in the first six centuries I have noted the practice of a few of the MSS. of this period which are easily accessible in printed texts, and add the results. These MSS. are (1) the older Vergil MSS. (Ribbeck's A, F, G, M, P, R, V), (2) the Vatican MS. of Cicero in *Verrem* (Cic. Verr. Vatic.), (3) the Vatican MS. of Cicero de *republica* (Cic. de rep. Vatic.), (4) the Paris MS. of Livy xxvi-xxx. (Liv. Putean.), (5) fragments of Pliny bks. i. and xi-xv. (Plin. Lavant.), further the Ambrosian MS. of Plautus (A) and the Bembinus of Terence (A) the readings of which are taken mainly from Dorsch's work.

*ad* before *f*, *s*, *n*, *l*, or *r*

Priscian (Keil, *Gram. Lat.* ii. p. 57): 'Haec tamen ipsa consonans in *ad* praepositione mutatur sequente *c* vel *g* vel *p* vel *t*, ut *accumbo*, *accido*, *aggero*, *applico*, *appello*, *attingo*, *attinet*; *f* quoque sequente rationalibus: *affectus*, *l*: *allido*, *r*: *assideo*, *n*: *annuo*, *s*: *assiduus*. . . Frequenter tamen invenimus *f* vel *l* vel *n* vel *s* sequentibus *d* scriptam, ut *adfatur*, *adludo*, *adrideo*, *adnitor*, *adisto*, *adsumo*. Errore tamen scriptorum hoc fieri puto quam ratione, nam quae sit differentia euphoniae, ut, cum eadem consonans sit sequens, in aliis transferatur *d*, in aliis non, scire non possum, ut, cum dicam *affectus*, *allido* et *assiduus*, bene sonet, cum autem *adfatur*, *alludo*, *assisto*, male.'

*ad f.*

#### INSCRIPTIONS.

*adfero*. *adferatur* i. 1984<sub>1</sub> (123/2 B.C.), *adferre* x. 4872<sub>27</sub> (Augustus), *adferrent* vi. 1750 (4th cent. A.D.), *adferri* Orelli 2230. No example of *affero* noted.

*adfui* is frequent at all periods, e.g. *adfuerunt* in the whole series of the *Acta Arvalium*. No *affui* noted.

*adfirmit*. *adf[ir]m[en]tes* vi. 1527 (Augustan period). No *affirmit* noted.

*adfigo*. *adfixus* v. 2781<sub>19</sub>. No *affixus* noted.

*adfigo*. *adfectus* vi. 1750 (4th cent.),

15268, v. 2117, 7882, viii. 2722, Boissieu Insc. de Lyon, p. 777. No *afflictus* noted.

*adfatus* vi. 1789 (425/450 A.D.), v. 6723. No *affatus* noted.

*adfinis*. *adfinis* common, e.g. vi. 10234 (86 A.D.), 10229 (108 A.D.), v. 2117, 4352, viii. 8934, etc. cf. *atfinis*, e.g. vi. 10247 (252 A.D.); Only one example of *affinis* noted, namely vi. 8401 (577 A.D.).

*adfinitas* vi. 1730<sub>7</sub>, <sup>10</sup> (4th cent.), 1731, Eph. Ep. ii. p. 223 (Lex Col. Gen., 1st cent. A.D.). No *affinitas* noted.

*adficio*. *adfecisse* v. 532 (138/161); *adfectus* noted in sixteen examples, one from the end of the 5th century (xii. 1724). Only one example of *affectus* noted (vi. 11511 of uncertain date). Note also *adfectu* xii. 1724 (end of 5th cent.).

*adfectio* noted in thirty cases (note xiv. 2934 from end of 4th cent.). No *affectio* noted.

*astuentia*. Edict Diocl. († Aegypt. version has *astuntiam*, Plataean *stuentiam*; the spelling is so careless that no absolute confidence can be placed in this).

Mss.

A fragment of Pap. Herc. shows *adfini*. Cf. Lindsay, *Class. Rev.* iv. p. 442. Plaut. A (Ambrosianus) and Terence A (Bembinus) show *adf*- without exception; so Dorsch pp. 20, 21.<sup>2</sup>

The Vergil MSS. have *adfero*, *adficio*, *adfigo*, *adfligo*, *adflo*, *adfluo*, *adfor* (over 25 examples). In these words, except for three examples in M, *aff* is found only in the later MSS. In the case of two words Ribbeck puts *aff* in his text, namely *affatu* Aen. iv. 284 (with P and some minor MSS. against *adf* of M), and *affabilis* Aen. iii. 621, which replaces the *effabilis* of most of the MSS. after the reading of Macrobius, Priscian, etc. (MSS. of 9th-10th cent.).

Cic. Verr. Vatic. has *adfero*, *adficio*, *adfirmit*, *adfectus*, *adfui*. No *aff* noted.

Cic. de rep. Vatic. has *adfero*, *adfirmit*, *adfigo*, *adfligo*. No *aff* noted.

Liv. Putean. has *adfatim*, *adfero*, *adfigo*, *adfinitas*, *adfirmit*, *adfligo*, *adflo*, *adfluo*,

<sup>1</sup> Lindsay's *Latin Inscriptions*, p. 110, reads *afflatu* in a fragment from the Herc. Papyri, but this must be a misprint. Bährens, *Poet. Lat. Min.* i. p. 218, reads *adflatu*, the first two letters being supplied, as they are not given in either the Oxford or the Neapolitan facsimiles.

<sup>2</sup> Studemund, *Apographum*, gives in the index twenty-eight cases of *adf*- and three of *aff*-, but of these two are indistinct, and in one the reading is *offert*. The words occurring are *adfatim*, *adfero*, *adficio*, *adfigo*, *adfinis*, *adfinitas*, *adflo*, *adfectus*, *adfui*.

*adfui, adfulgeo.* *aff* noted only in *affectus* and here usually *adfectus*.

Plin. Lavant. has *adfero, adflo.* No *aff* noted.

## GRAMMARIANS.

The earlier grammarians prescribe *adf*. Cornutus (ap. Cassiodorus, Keil vii. p. 151) says that *d* is pronounced and written before *f*, as *adfluo, adfui, adfectus*. Similarly Caecilius Vindex (ap. Cass., K. vii. p. 207) of Hadrian's time, citing *adfluo, adfari, adfuturus, adfatus, adfero*. Velius Longus and Terentius Scaurus do not mention this combination when speaking of assimilation. Even Papirian and Agroecius of the 5th century still cite *adfert, adfui, adficit*.

The first mention of *aff*, unless one reads *affero* and not *suffero* in a passage of Donatus (K. iv. p. 391), is in Servius, Comm. in Don., K. iv. pp. 442, who cites *affero* and *afficio*, adding 'Nam *affero*, quod scribebatur per *a* et per *d*, incipit scribi per *a* et *f*.' Observe 'incipit scribi.' Priscian cites *affectus* but knows of *adfatur*.

The evidence for the spelling *adf* is so overwhelming, that school-books should not give *aff* even as variant, unless as a temporary concession to a practice still the most common. As for the pronunciation, the writer can see no ground whatever for assuming the assimilated pronunciation for the first century A.D. The spelling is always *adf* or, what is even more significant, *atf* occasionally, and we have, moreover, the express statement of Cornutus.

*ad-s.*

## INSCRIPTIONS.

*adsentio. adsensus* xi. 5265<sup>38</sup> (4th cent.).  
*adsero. adserit* xii. 4036, *adsereretis*  
 Dessau, Insc. Lat. Select. 705, *adserere* vi.  
 1783 (5th cent.), *adseruisse* v. 5321<sup>11</sup>  
 (138/161 A.D.), *adseruerunt* iii. 352<sup>32</sup>.  
*adsertor. adsertore*, name of a horse, vi.  
 10050, 10056.  
*adservio. adservisse* v. 532 (138/161 A.D.).  
*adseruo. adservata* vi. 1783<sup>24</sup> (5th cent.),  
*adsequor. adsequi* ix. 3895.  
*adsuesco. adsuetus* xi. 3303 (13 A.D.),  
 Dessau 212 (48 A.D.).  
*adsumo. adsumendorum, adsumptis* iii.  
 781 (201 A.D.), *adsumpto* x. 6662.  
*adsisto. adsistente* Orelli-Henzen 6753  
 (2nd—3rd cent.).  
*adsedeo. adsedit* Orelli 3039, *adsedente*  
 Orelli 2545.  
*adsector* ii. 2129 (twice).  
*adsum* frequent.

Of the words thus far cited no forms with *ss* have been noted.

*adsido. assidat* iv. 2887 (*assidat ad asinum*).

*adsigno. assignatus* occurs twenty-five times on the Lex Agraria (i. 200) of 111 B.C., on the Acta Arvalium of 81 A.D., and on numerous other inscriptions of various dates—in all over forty examples have been noted. Cf. also *atsignavi* vi. 10247 (252 A.D.), and *atsignatus* eight times on the Lex Col. Genet. (Eph. Ep. ii. iii.) inscribed in the 1st century A.D. The only example of the assimilated form noted is *assignavit* v. 7783 (191 A.D.). The *assignato* quoted by Brambach, p. 298 is corrected by Brambach himself, p. x., to *adsignato*.

*adsiduus* noted in eighteen examples, including *atsiduus* ix. 729. The only example of the assimilated form noted is *perassiduus* xii. 944 (553 A.D.). The *assiduis* quoted by Brambach, p. 298, from Gruter I have not found.

## MSS.

Pap. Herc. have *adsiduo*.

Plautus A has *adsero, adseruo, adsimiliter, adsimulo, adsisto, adsileo, adsum* with *ds* only, but *assiduus* (1) beside *adsiduus* (2), *assido* (1) beside *adsido* (4); cf. Studemund's Apographon, index. In Terence *ass* is found only in some of the later MSS.; cf. Dorsch, p. 24.

The Vergil MSS. have *adsentio, adsensus, adseruo, adsimilis* (*ats-*), *adsimulo* (*ats-*), *adsisto, adsuesco, adsum* (frequent), *adsurgo*, and *adsiduus*. Outside of the late MSS. *ass* is found only once, namely *assiduus* in R.

Cic. Verr. Vatic. has *adsentio, adseruo, adsequor, adsigno, adsum*. No *ass* noted.

Cic. de rep. Vatic. has *adsentio, adsequor, adsido, adsiduus, adsigno, adsisto, adsum, adsumo, adsuesco*. Only one example of *ass* has been noted, namely *assimulo*.

Liv. Putean. has *adsentio, adsentatio, adsequor, adseruo, adsideo, adsigno, adsimulo, adsuesco, adsuefacio, adsumo, adsurgo*. No example of *ass* noted.

Plin. Lavant. has *adseruo, adsiduus, adsiduitas, adsimilatio, adsuesco, adsultim, adsum*. No example of *ass* noted.

## GRAMMARIANS.

The grammarians prescribe *ass*, or rather they state that *assiduus* is to be so spelled. So Cornutus, Caper, Caecilius Vindex, Marius Victorinus, Charisius, Papirian, and Priscian. The latter mentions also *assideo* (*asside* Diomedes), but cites *adsumo, adsisto* as forms in which *d* is frequently written. It

is not unnatural that *adsiduus* should be one of the first words to yield to assimilation, but even here the spelling with *d* remained the usual one.

While it is clear, then, that the spelling *ads* is preferable for all words, the question of the pronunciation is more complicated. The oft-cited pun of Plautus on *adsum* and *assum* (Poen. 279) is sometimes regarded as a proof that the spelling of *adsum* and similar words is a snare and a delusion. But the pun proves nothing more than the existence of a vulgar pronunciation *assum*, and in view of the consistency of the spelling and the fact that in this word the force of the preposition was clearly felt, it does not seem reasonable to suppose that the pronunciation of cultivated Romans, or in other words in the High Latin as taught in the schools, was other than *adsum* at any period. The *assidat* scratched on the walls of Pompeii may be regarded in the same light. But doubtless the assimilated pronunciation gained ground among the educated in proportion to the weakness of the force of the preposition, and it is evident from the statements of the grammarians that in their time the pronunciation *assiduus* had become widely prevalent. It was even suggested that the word was not derived from *sedeo*, as those who wrote *adsiduus* supposed, but from *asses* (Charisius, K. i., p. 75; cf. also Stilo, quoted by Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* p. 313). Note that *assiduus* and *assidat* are the only assimilated forms in Plautus A. It seems to the writer that we should pronounce as well as spell *ads*, and that it is not necessary to make an exception of *assiduus* since even here the pronunciation *adsiduus* probably lasted well into the first century and even later.

#### *ad-n.*

#### INSCRIPTIONS.

The only examples noted are *adnumerare* viii. 2554, *adnicens* xii. 944 (553 A.D.), and *admitente* xii. 1524 (5th cent.).

#### Mss.

Plautus A has *adnuo* and Terence A *adnumero*. The other Plautus MSS. have also *adnitor*, *adnumero*, *adnuto*, *adnuo*: *annuo* in one passage. Cf. Dorsch p. 22.

The Vergil MSS. have *adnicens* (7 times, no var.), *adno* (3, no var.), *adnuo* (10, *annuo* sometimes in later MSS.).

Cic. Verr. Vatic. has *adnumero*, but *annuo*.

NO. CXIII. VOL. XIII.

Liv. Putean. has *adnitor*, *adnumero*.  
Plin. Lavant. has *adnecto*.

#### GRAMMARIANS.

The grammarians, as far as they speak of this, prescribe assimilation, but always with the same example, namely *annuo*. So Cornutus, Caecilius Vindex, Papirian, and Priscian, but Priscian mentions *adnitor*. Cf. the passage quoted above. Notwithstanding the way in which the grammarians copied each other, this agreement in the example chosen is significant. In the sources we have examined *adnuo* is the only word for which there is any evidence of the assimilated spelling, and even here *adnuo* is more common. It is natural that in this word, in which the literal meaning *nod at* was not ordinarily felt, the assimilation took place earlier than in the others, and as Cornutus mentions *annuo* we may assume that the change in pronunciation took place in the first century. We should write and pronounce *adn-*, the only possible exception being *annuo*, and this not necessary or, in the writer's opinion, desirable.

#### *ad-l.*

#### INSCRIPTIONS.

*adlevo*, *adlevet* C.I.L. vi. 10230 (Augustan period), *adlevata* vi. 1527 d 13 (Augustan period), *adlevavit* xiv. 3608<sub>86</sub> (70 A.D.).

*adluo*, *adluerunt* ix. 4744, *adluentibus* x. 6811 (238 A.D.).

*adlego*, -are. *adlegantibus* viii. 8813-4 (2nd cent.), viii. 10570 (180-3 A.D.), *adlegatei* v. 2845.

*adlego*, -ere. *adlegantur* vi. 10234 (153 A.D.), *adlegit* xiv. 431 (3rd cent.), *adlegerunt* x. 846, 1403, *adlectus* (fifty-five examples noted) is more common than *allectus* (twenty examples noted). Most of the examples of *allectus*, as far as the inscriptions are dated, are from the second and third centuries. But ix. 5553 is from the first century.

*adlector* vi. 355.

*adlecto*, *adlectavit* vi. 18086.

*adlatus*, *adlaturus* and *allatus* (twice) on the same inscription, x. 7852 (69 A.D.), *allatae* Act. Arval. of 43 A.D., *alatus* iv. 1239 (Pompeii), cf. *rellatus* i. 200<sub>80</sub>.

*alligo*, *alligat* vi. 12649, 20905.

#### Mss.

Plautus A has *adlego* (-are), *adlicio*, *adloquor*, *adlucco*, *adludio* with *dl* only, but *alatus* (4), besides *adlatus* (1), and *alligo*. In Terence we find *alligo*, but elsewhere *adl*.

The Vergil MSS. have *allabor*, *allacrimo*, *adloquor*, *adludo*, *adluo* (*alluo* once in P), but *alligo* (3, without variant).

Cic. Verr. Vatic. has *adluo*.

Cic. de rep. Vatic. has *adluo*.

Liv. Putean. has *adluo*, *adloquor* usually, but also *alloquor*, and *allatus* regularly.

Plin. Lavant. has *adlino*.

#### GRAMMARIANS.

The grammarians prescribe assimilation, but the example is usually the same, namely *alligo*; so Cornutus, Caecilius Vindex, Diomedes, Papirian. But Terentius Scaurus (K. vii. p. 26) in citing *alligo* with *lego*, *colligo*, *pelligo* refers, of course, to the compound of *lego*, and Velius Longus (K. vi. p. 62) cites *alligere* (or *allegere*), adding 'nec semper tamen, quoniam dicimus *adluere* et *adloqui* et *adlabi*.' Priscian cites *allido*, but knows of *adludo*.

For most words we should spell *dl* and so pronounce (note the *dicimus* of Velius Longus). But *alligo* is the only proper form, as attested by the evidence of inscr., MSS., grammarians, and further by Pliny's *ad-alligo* (Lindsay, Lat. Lang., p. 311). *Allatus* is more common than *ad-latus*. The existence of *allectus* in the first century is established, but as *adlectus* continues to be its more common spelling we may well retain it.

#### *ad-r.*

#### INSCRIPTIONS.

The only examples noted are *adrogaretur* v. 61 and *arripiebatur* viii. 10832 (probably of the 3rd cent.).

#### Mss.

Plautus A has *adrideo*, but *arripio*. Terence A has *adrideo*, but *arriigo* and *arripio* (once *adripio*, but here other MSS. *arr.*). Cf. Dorsch p. 22.

The Vergil MSS. have *arripio* (no *adr.*) and *arrectus* (frequent). Other compounds of *ad-r.* do not occur.

Cic. de rep. Vatic. has *adrogo* and *adrogantia*.

Liv. Putean. has *adrodo*, *adrectus*, but *arripio*.

Plin. Lavant. has *adrepo*, *adrodo*.

#### GRAMMARIANS.

Cornutus and Priscian give *arrideo*, though the latter mentions also *adrideo*. Terentius Scaurus (K. vii. p. 25) says that *adripit* is wrong and Diomedes (K. i. p. 424) cites

*arripe*. Agroeius, however, says that *d* remains unchanged in *adripit* (K. vii. p. 123).

The inscriptional material is so meagre that we are forced to rely mainly on the spelling of MSS., and, though this furnishes no direct evidence, we observe in the case of other combinations how little the spelling of the early MSS. differs from the inscriptional spelling of the first century. As *arripio* is almost the universal spelling it is probable that the assimilation took place at a very early date, as in *corripio* and *surripio*. So, too, *arriigo* seems preferable to *adripio*. But *adrideo*, notwithstanding the statement of Cornutus, is not only the spelling of the Plautus and Terence MSS. but is usual in the MSS. of the 9th–11th centuries, so that this spelling is preferred in most of our best critical editions. Note for example Plin. *Nat. Hist.* xvii. 15 (Sillig), Plin. *Epist.* i. 24 (Keil), *Lucr.* ii. 32 (Lachmann), *Hor. Sat.* i. 10, 88 (Keller-Holder). For *adrado*, *adrepo*, *adrodo* there can be no question. In the case of *adrogo* all the early evidence that we have favours *adr.*, though most of our critical editions read *arrogo* with late MSS. We should write, then, *arripio* and *arriigo* (probably), but elsewhere *adr.*

*con* and *in* before *l* and *r*.

#### *in-l.*

#### INSCRIPTIONS.

*inlustris* noted in twenty-six examples, extending into the fifth century or later (e.g. viii. 988). No example of *illustris* found.

*inlustro*, *Notizie degli Scavi* 1897, p. 363.

*inlatus* frequent at all periods, e.g. thirteen times in the *Acta Arvalium* from 80 A.D. to 213 A.D., xiv. 374 (4th cent. or later), eleven times in viii., etc. No example of *illatus* found.

*inlatio*. *Acta Arvalium* of 219, 220 and 224 A.D.

*inlumino* viii. 7006 (4th cent.), 7994, 6982 (three times), vi. 1779 (4th cent.).

*inlibatus* x. 5409.

*inligo* vi. 5302.

*inlicitus* vi. 1711 (488 A.D.), v. 5737 (6th cent.).

*inludo* viii. 8567.

#### Mss.

Pap. Herc. has *inlita*.

Plautus A and Terence A have *inl-* without exception. Cf. Dorsch p. 36.

The Vergil MSS. have *inl-* without exception (*ill* only in the later MSS.), e.g. *inlabor*, *inlacrimo*, *inlaetabilis*, *inlaudo*, *inlautus*, *inlido*, *inluceo*, *inludo*, *inlustris*, *inluvis*.

Cic. Verr. Vatic. has *inlustris*.

Cic. rep. Vatic. has *inlecebra*, *inliberaliter*, *inludo*, *inlustris*, *inlusto*.

Liv. Putean. has *inlatus*, *inlectus*, *inluceo*, *inlusto*.

Plin. Lavant. has *inliceo*, *inlino*, *inludo*, *inlustris*.

## GRAMMARIANS.

The combination is usually treated in connection with *con-l*, but the first to cite *ill* seems to be Marius Victorinus (K. vi. p. 19) of the fourth century, who is an extremist in the matter of assimilation, demanding *suvertit* for *subvertit*, etc. Priscian, in the passage quoted above, cites *illido*, but knows of *inludo*. In two other passages (K. ii. p. 30, iii. p. 50) he cites *illido*, once adding that when *l* or *r* follow the *n* this assimilation is rarely observed in the writing, though in his opinion we ought to imitate the Greeks as in other matters.

The evidence is unusually decisive, not a single example of *ill* from the first six centuries having been observed in the material collated. That the pronunciation in the first century was other than *inl* is highly improbable.

*in-r.*

## INSCRIPTIONS.

*inreparabilis* iii. 2756.

*inrigus* iii. 1894 (5th cent.).

*inritus* x. 1401 (44-56 A.D.).<sup>1</sup>

*inrogo* i. 197<sub>11</sub>, i. 198<sub>13</sub> (both of 2nd cent. B.C.).

*inrumpo* viii. 2615 (260 A.D.).

*irruo*, *irrumator*, *irrumabiliter* iv. 2277, 1529, 1931.

## MSS.

Pap. Herc. has *inridens*.

Plautus A and Terence A have *inr* without exception. Cf. Studemund. *Apogr.* index, and Dorsch, p. 36.

The Vergil MSS. have *inremeabilis*, *inreparabilis*, *inrideo*, *inrigo* (*irr-* once in M), *inrigus*, *inritus* (*irr-* once in F), *inrogo*, *inrumpo*, *inruo*; altogether only two cases of *irr-* outside of the late MSS.

Cic. Verr. Vatic. has *inrideo*, *inritus*.

<sup>1</sup> This is the inscription from which Brambach quotes *inritus* beside *inritus*. The stone is lost and the text rests on three copies. The *Corpus* reads *inritus* in both places without noting any variant.

Liv. Putean. has *inritus*, *inritamentum*, *inruo*, *inruptio*.

## GRAMMARIANS.

Marius Victorinus (K. vi. p. 19) as usual gives assimilated forms, citing *irrepat*, *irrogat*, *irruit*. Priscian gives *irrito* (K. ii. p. 31) and *irruo*, *irritus* (K. iii. p. 51). But in the former passage he gives *inrumpo* and *inruo* as examples of the preservation of *n*, adding 'in multis tamen invenio *r* sequente *n* in *r* converti, ut *corruo*, *corrumpto*, et paene ubicumque *con* prepositio ante dictionem ab *r* incipientem componitur, hoc idem patitur; *corruo*, *corrigo*, . . . ergo rationabilis esse videtur, in quoque, cum in quibusdam mutet *n* in *r*, ut *irrito*, *irriguus*, in reliquis quoque euphonia hoc exigente servare et *irruo*, *irrumperere* dicere, cum nec in simplicibus inveniatur dictionibus *n* ante *r*.'

This passage is interesting as disclosing certain facts which the grammarian, from failure to recognize the psychological factor in composition, was unable to understand. In his time assimilation was found in some compounds of *in-r*, while others still resisted it, and again there was a difference between the treatment of *in-r* and *con-r*. This difference, which seems to be due to the stronger local force of the *in-* in some words (or the negative force in *inritus*), is clearly seen in *corrumpto*: *inrumpto*, which existed side by side for centuries. For *corrumpto* is established for the first century, while it is evident that *inrumpto* was in use even in Priscian's time.

The inscriptional and MSS. evidence in favour of the spelling *inr* is so overwhelming that there is no room for doubt, and as regards the pronunciation of the first century there is no good reason for assuming that this was not in accordance with the spelling, notwithstanding the Pompeian *irrumo*. For the pronunciation of this obscene word cannot be taken as an indication of the general practice in cultivated speech.

*con-l.*

*collegium*, *conlegium*, the spelling of the republican period, begins to yield to *collegium* in the Augustan period, and from Tiberius on the latter spelling is well-nigh universal. Cf. above, p. 156.

*collega*. The history of the spelling is identical with that of *collegium*.

*colligo*, *conlegit* x. 6428, *conlectus* x. 1935, 5428; but *colligit* xiv. 396, 3857,



*colligerent* ix. 5420 (82 A.D.), *colligi* iii. 567 (end of 2nd cent.), xi. 3893, *collectus* v. 5050 (46 A.D.), viii. 2653 (2nd cent.), 4372-3.

*collectarius* iii. 405.

*conloco*. *conloco* noted in over thirty examples, extending from the second century B.C. (Lex Agraria) to the fifth century A.D. or later. *E.g.* xiv. 2934 (385 A.D.), vi. 1698 (377 A.D.), viii. 988 ('5th, 6th or 7th cent.'). The assimilated form has been noted only in vi. 1702 (after 366 A.D.), 1710 (5th cent.), 1712 (370 A.D.), 1769 (342 A.D.), x. 1256, viii. 1925 (*colocata*), Dessau Insc. Lat. Sel. 1252, iii. 19 (4th cent.).

*conlabor*. *conlapsus* (or *conlabrus*) noted in thirty-five examples, *collapsus* (or *collabsus*) in seven. No dated example of the latter earlier than Trajan's time (x. 6853, vi. 962) has been noted.

*conlatus*. *conlatus* noted in over seventy examples, *collatus* in thirteen. No dated example of the latter earlier than Hadrian's time has been noted.

*conlatio*. *conlatio* ii. 1971, x. 7495 : *collatio* x. 1576 (2nd cent.). Edict Diocl. has *collatio* in the versions of Stratonice and Plataea, but *conlatio* in that of Egypt.

*conlator* ii. 637.

*conlibertus*. Both *conlibertus* and *collibertus* are so common that an exact record was not kept up, but I think it safe to say that *con-* is decidedly more frequent than *coll-*.

*conlacteus*, Boissieu, Inscr. de Lyon, p. 484, no. 8.

*collectaneus* xii. 337, xiv. 2413.

*collacterianus* xi. 1147 (Trajan).

*conlutor* ii. 3853.

*conlustris* v. 5005 (201 A.D.).

*conloquium* v. 6464 (6th cent.), viii. 944 (553 A.D.).

Mss.

Plautus A has *conlabasco*, *conlaudo*, *conloquor*, *conlubitum*, *conlino*, *conloco*,<sup>1</sup> *conligere*, but *colligare*, *collibertus*. Terence A has *colligare*, and *conligere*, elsewhere always *con-*. Cf. Dorsch, p. 31.

The Vergil MSS. have *conlapsus*, *conloquium*, *conlustris*, *conluceo* (6, *coll-* once in in M), *conludo* (R) and *colludo* (M), *conloco* (PR) and *colloco* (M), *conlatus* (PR) and *collatus* (M), but *colligare* nearly always (about twenty-four occurrences in which *con-* is found only three times).

Cic. Verr. Vatic. has *conloco* and *colloco*, *conlatus* and *collaturus*.

<sup>1</sup> Studemund, *Apogr. Index*, gives one case of *colloco*, but the *l* is marked as uncertain in the text.

Cic. rep. Vatic. has *conloquor*, *conligere*, *conloco* and *colloco*, *collatus*, *colligare*, *collega*, *collegium*.

Liv. Putean. has *conlacrimo*, *conlapsus*, *conlatus*, *conlatio*, *conloquium* (very frequent), but *colligo* (rarely *conlectus*), *collega* (usually, but *conlega* not infrequent), *collegium*.

Plin. Lavant. has *conloco* but *colligo*.

#### GRAMMARIANS.

Quintilian, xi. 3, 35, mentions the avoidance of a harsh combination in *collegit*. Terentius Scaurus (K. vii. p. 25-6) approves *colligo*, stating also that some wrongly use *conludit*. Marius Victorinus (K. vi. p. 19) cites *collectum*, *collatum*, *collinit*. Priscian's examples are *colligo*, *collega*, *collido* (K. ii. p. 30, iii. p. 50).

A decisive statement of the proper spelling and pronunciation of all words of this class is difficult. In contrast to the uniform spelling *inl* we find a different practice in the case of different words (cf. the remarks on *inr* : *corr*, above). It is perfectly clear from the evidence of inscriptions and MSS. and the statement of Quintilian that from the first century on the assimilated form is preferable for *colligo* and its derivatives. It is equally clear that in the case of some other words as *conloco*, *conloquium*, *conlustris* the unassimilated spelling was the usual one throughout the first six centuries, and altogether probable that the pronunciation of the first century at least was in accordance with this. But this shows that each word must be judged on specific evidence, and this is sometimes less decisive than one would wish. For example, *conlapsus* and *conlatus* are far more frequent than *collapsus* and *collatus* and are clearly the preferable spellings. It is the writer's opinion that these also represent the best pronunciation of the first century, but as the assimilated forms appear much earlier than in the case of *conloco*, one cannot feel as certain of this. We shall probably come as near as possible to the truth if we write and pronounce *colligo* and compounds, but *conl* in all other words.

*con-r.*

#### INSCRIPTIONS.

*conrumpro*. *corruptus* vi. 1258 (201 A.D.), iii. 3724 (3rd cent.), xiv. 66.

*corrumpro* x. 1194, 4842 (Augustus), vi. 15258; *corruptus* noted in over twenty examples, the earliest being ii. 1953 (53 A.D.).

*conrigo* i. 1438, *conrectus* i. 206<sub>13</sub> (45 B.C.).  
*corrigo* x. 5398 (214 A.D.); *corrector* noted  
 in some twenty odd examples as an official  
 title belonging to the third and fourth  
 centuries; *correctura* x. 5061 (4th cent.).

*conruo* xiv. 1808.

*corrogo* xi. 3614 (113 A.D.).

## MSS.

Plautus A has *conrado*, *conruo*, *conrepo*  
 and *correpo*, but *corrigo* and *corrumpo*,  
 Terence A has *conrado*, but *corripio*, *cor-*  
*rumpo*. Cf. Studemund, index; Dorsch,  
 pp. 29-30.

The Vergil MSS. have *corripio* (no var.),  
*corrumpo* (*conr-* once in P), *corruo*.

Cic. Verr. Vatic. has *corrigo*, *corripio*,  
*corrumpo*, *corrogo*.

Liv. Putean. has *corrigo*, *corripio*, *cor-*  
*rumpo*, *corruo* (rarely *conruo*).

Plin. Lavant. has *corrigo*, *corrumpo*.

## GRAMMARIANS.

Terentius Scaurus (K. vii. pp. 25-6)  
 gives *corripio* and censures the use of  
*conripit*. Marius Victorinus (K. vi. p. 19)  
 cites *corradi*, *corripit*, *corrodit*, *corrumpit*.  
 Priscian gives *corrigo*, *corrumpo* (K. ii. p.  
 31) and *corripio* (K. iii. p. 51). Note his  
 remarks quoted above under *invr*.

For *corrumpo* we have the evidence of  
 inscriptions, MSS. and grammarians. The  
 first example of the word is from the time  
 of Augustus, but it is not unlikely that the  
 assimilated form was in use from the  
 earliest period. The occasional occurrences  
 of *conrumpe* are to be viewed in the same  
 light as *adacipio*, the appearance of which  
 does not alter the fact that *accipio* is the  
 proper form for all periods. Though  
 inscriptional evidence is lacking, the case of  
*corripio* is almost certainly the same.  
 Between the *conrigo* of the republic and  
*corrigo* of the third century there is a gap  
 in the evidence, but the uniform spelling of  
 the MSS. makes it probable that *corrigo*  
 was the usual form of the first century. So  
 probably *corrogo*. For other words the  
 evidence is meagre or conflicting. In  
*conrado*, *conrepo*, *conruo* the assimilation  
 seems to have been later than in *corrumpo*  
 etc., but we cannot fix its date, and in the  
 lack of decisive evidence may, for the sake  
 of uniformity, incline to the assimilated  
 forms. We should then write *corr-* every-  
 where.

## SUNDRY OTHER COMBINATIONS.

Before leaving the subject of assimilation  
 in compounds, a few statements of a pro-

visional nature may be added, in reference  
 to some combinations not considered in the  
 preceding study, and for some of which a  
 more complete collection of facts would be  
 desirable.

*sub-m-, ob-m-.* If our traditional spelling,  
 where it differs from that of the first  
 century, usually errs on the side of showing  
 assimilated forms which prove to be of late  
 origin, the opposite is the case for some  
 compounds of *sub* with verbs beginning with  
*m*. Our grammars and school editions  
 prefer *submoveo*, though this is clearly due to  
 a late recomposition. *summotu* and *summotu*  
 occur nine times in the *Acta Arvalium*, the  
 dates running from 81 A.D. to 183 A.D., while  
*submotu* is found only twice, if I mistake  
 not, both examples from the second half of  
 the second century A.D. Note further  
*summotu* xiv. 3608<sub>24</sub>, Orelli 3129, *summotu*  
 Orelli 3166 (4th cent.), but *submoveri* v.  
 2781<sub>25</sub> (4th cent. and a copy). The Vergil  
 MSS. have *summoveo* (four times; *sub-*  
*only* in minor MSS.); so also Liv. Putean.  
 regularly. It is also the best reading in  
 many texts for which we have only late  
 MSS., e.g. Hor. *Carm.* ii. 10, 15; ii. 16, 10  
 (Keller-Holder), Plin. *Ep.* iii. 11 (Keil),  
 Caes. *B.G.* iv. 25, vii. 50, viii. 10 (Nipperdei).  
 Velius Longus, Papirian and Priscian give  
*summoveo*. For *summitto* I have no in-  
 scriptional material, but in early MSS.  
*summitto* is the more common spelling, e.g.  
 in the Vergil MSS., in Liv. Putean., Cic.  
 Verr. Vatic.; for other material see Neue,  
*Formenlehre*, pp. 914-5. *summitto* is also  
 given by Priscian. *summonuit* is the reading  
 of all the MSS. in Ter. *Eun.* 570 (Dorsch  
 p. 16). Cicero must have said *summutavit*,  
 as is evident from *Orat.* 47, 158, 'adiuncti  
 verbi prima littera praepositionem commu-  
 tavit, ut *subegit*, *summutavit*, *sustulit*,' though  
 the MSS. give *submutavit* and *tum mutavit*.  
 Between *submergo* and *summergo* the MSS.  
 vary (e.g. of the Vergil MSS., FR have  
*summersus*, M *submersus*, but *submergere* in  
 M and R); similarly between *subministro*  
 and *sumministro*, the latter being given by  
 Velius Longus and Papirian. The assim-  
 ilated form is, then, unquestionable for *sum-*  
*moveo* and almost certainly to be preferred  
 for the other words mentioned; not, how-  
 ever for adjectives like *submerus*, *submolestus*.  
 For compounds of *ob* the existence of assim-  
 ilation is proved by *omitto* which comes from  
 \**om-mitto* (Sohlsen, *Studien zur lat. Laut-*  
*geschichte*, p. 62), and by *ommentarius* quoted  
 by Festus (ed. Thewrewk, p. 218) from  
 Livius Andronicus. There is good MS.  
 authority for *ommutesco* and *ommoveo*; and

the former is given by Velius Longus as well as by some of the Latin grammarians. But in other compounds, as *obmolior*, only the unassimilated form is found, and even for the two cited this is the more common spelling in MSS. Until some inscriptional evidence is adduced it is safer to retain *obm* everywhere. Except in *ob-mutesco* the local force is stronger in the compounds of *ob* than in those of *sub*.

*con* and *in* before labials. The variation seen between *impensa* and *impensarum* of the *Monumentum Ancyranum* is of an entirely different nature from that between *collegium* and *conlegium* of the same monument. It is not a matter of chronology, one form being the older, the other the later spelling, but such variation is found at all periods and is in part connected with the uncertainty in the use of *n* and *m* before mutes in general, as in *semper* for *sententiam* for *sententiam*, etc. That is, in the pronunciation of nasals before mutes the contact is less complete, and hence the difference between *m* and *n* less marked, than when they stood between vowels; so that the non-assimilated spelling, in which the normal forms of *in* and *con* were apparent, might be used freely without indicating a pronunciation different from that of the forms with *im* and *com*. In any given document there may be some difference as to the relative frequency of the unassimilated spelling among different words, but, so far as observed, there is no general agreement in this matter and for no words is the unassimilated spelling so consistent as to imply that the form was actually unassimilated in pronunciation. We should give unreserved preference to the assimilated spelling.

*ad-q.* *ad-qui*esco and *ad-qui*ro are the only forms of inscriptions and MSS. of the first six centuries, the spelling *ac-q* being later, perhaps not earlier than the ninth or tenth century. From inscriptions note for example *adquiesco* v. 7386, 7392, viii. 9350, ix. 3895, 5331, xii. 855a; *adqui*ro x. 1401, xiv. 2101, *atqui*ro Eph. Ep. iii. Priscian also gives *adqui*ro.

*ad-g.* The grammarians give *agg*, the example being *aggero*, Priscian adding *aggrego*. But *adgregior* seems to be the only form until very late, e.g. Orelli 39 (2nd century), in the Vergil MSS., in Liv. *Putean.*, Plin. *Lavant.*, Plaut. A. and Ter. A. Similarly *adgravo* C.I.L. ii. 1359, Liv. *Putean.*, *adgravesco* Ter. A., *adglomer*o Vergil MSS. On the other hand *aggero* is the form of the Vergil MSS. and Plautus A. So far

as we can judge, *aggero* is the only word in which there is any evidence for assimilated spelling in the first few centuries A.D., and without inscriptional evidence one cannot feel certain that even here the assimilated spelling was in vogue in the first century, though this seems likely. For *agger*, *agger-are* in which there was no consciousness of the preposition there is of course no doubt of the assimilation.

*ad-c, ad-t, ad-p.* The grammarians prescribe assimilation, and it is doubtful if we can do better than follow them. But it must be recognised that there is a vast difference in the relative frequency of the unassimilated spelling among different words. For example *accipio*, *appello* (-are) is the almost invariable spelling of inscriptions and MSS. of all periods. There are to be sure some MSS. occurrences of *adcipio*, *adpello*, but I should venture the assertion that these did not amount to more than one in a thousand of the total occurrences of the words. In these the influence of the preposition was not strong enough even to affect the spelling seriously, not to speak of the pronunciation. In other words, as for example *accurro*, *accendo*, *attineo*, *attingo* the unassimilated spelling is more common than in those just mentioned, but, still, less common than the assimilated, and that the influence of the preposition affected the spelling only is clear from remarks such as that of Lucilius about *accurro* ('Atque *accurrere* scribas *d* ne an *c*, non est quod quaeras atque labores') or of Velius Longus (K. vi. p. 62) that it made no difference whether one spelled *attineo* or *adttineo* since the sound was the same. Again, for still other words the unassimilated spelling seems to be decidedly the more common or even the only one among the quotable occurrences. This is notably true of compounds of *ad-p*, barring *appello* (-are), *appareo*, (*apparo appono*). So Liv. *Putean.*, has countless examples of *appello* never *adpello*, but *adplico*, *adpeto*, *adprobo*, *adpropinquo*, *adpono*, *adpuli*; Plin. *Lavant.* *appello*, *appareo*, but *adpeto*, *adprehendo*; Cic. *Verr. Vatic.* *appareo*, but *adprobo*, *adpono*; Cic. *rep. Vatic.* *appello*, but *adprehendo*, *adpeto*, *adprobo*; Plaut. A. and Ter. A. *appello*, *appareo*, *apparo* (usually *appono*), but *adplico*, *adprehendo*, *adprobo*, *adporto* (once *app-*), *adposco*. The remark of Agroeceus '*apparet* qui videtur, *adparet* qui obsequitur; non regulae ratione, sed discernendi intellectus gratia est' has been ridiculed by Brambach as a pure invention. But, though not for the purpose of distinguishing the meaning, such a variation in

spelling might very well be the *result* of the difference, the force of the preposition being more marked when the word meant 'attend upon.' It is clear that, certain words excepted, *adp-* is the almost uniform spelling of our earliest MSS., and it is doubtless for this reason that it is adopted in one of our most recent school editions.

Yet there are reasons why one may hesitate before accepting such a change without reservation. Is the spelling *adporto* etc. also that of republican times and of the first century A.D., in other words is its history like that of *adfero*? Unfortunately I have not always been on the watch for such words in my reading of the inscriptions; but for many of them there is, as far as I know, no actual occurrence of the assimilated form to contradict the supposition mentioned, and one might cite in its support the *adporto* x. 4842 (Augustan period) and *adprobo* beside *appello* on the inscription of Claudius at Lyons (Dessau no. 212), not to mention examples on later inscriptions. But there is on the other hand the possibility that *adporto* etc. rests merely on recomposition in the spelling (as *adcurro* beside *accurro*), replacing an earlier *apporto*, the lack of evidence of which would be merely accidental, due to the fact that the words do not happen to occur on republican inscriptions. In this case, we could not be certain whether the new spelling had become fully established in the first century A.D. or not. The *adporto* might be an isolated instance of it (note the collocation *adchere, adferre, adportare*) and in the inscription which has *adprobo* we find also *adensus*, though *accensus* is found in the *Acta Arvalium* and elsewhere. Suggestive of such a possibility is the statement of

Statius (*ad Aen.* I. 616) that *applicat* was the earlier spelling as against the *adplicat* of his own time. Moreover in the case of some words even the MS. spelling varies. So Plautus A. has *appono* five times to one of *adpono* and *appuli*, and the Terence A. varies in these words. But in Liv. *Putean.* we find (uniformly, I think) *adpono* and *adpuli*. Note also the Pompeian *apponitur* (*C.I.L.* iv. 1896). Finally, if one adopts *adporto* etc., one cannot consistently stop there. The compounds of *ad-c* and *ad-t* must be considered individually. I suspect for example that the evidence for *adcreco* is as strong as for *adporto*. A more thorough examination of all the material bearing on the combinations *ad-c*, *ad-t* and *ad-p* might bring some new light and enable us to accept without reservation the unassimilated spelling for some words. But at present the matter is not sufficiently evident.

*ad-sp*, *ad-sc*, *ad-st*, *ad-gn*. There is little to add to what is already known. The assimilated spelling is clearly better for *aspicio*, *aspergo*, the unassimilated for *adstruo*, *adstringo*, *adstipulor*, while usage varies between *ascendo* and *adscendo*, *ascribo* and *adscribo*, *ascisco* and *adscisco*, *asto* and *adsto*, *agnatus* and *adgnatus*, *agnosco* and *adgnosco*. In the *Acta Arvalium* we find *ascendo* and *asto*, but oftener *adscendo* and *adsto*. Both *asto* and *adsto* may be cited from other inscriptions. In general the inscriptional material is too meagre to permit a definite conclusion as to the relation of the two spellings, but one may venture the opinion that *ascendo* etc. represent the older and phonetic spelling, *adscendo* etc. being due to recomposition.

CARL DARLING BUCK.

*The University of Chicago.*

#### JURENKA'S *BACCHYLIDES*.

*Die neugefundenen Lieder des Bakchylides.*  
Text, Uebersetzung und Commentar von  
HUGO JURENKA. Wien. Alfred Hölder.  
1898. Pp. xx., 162. Marks 7.

This book represents the fruits of rather more than six months' work on Bacchylides from the appearance of the *Editio Princeps*. Embodying as it does a larger mass of illustration than was provided by Mr. Kenyon, and professing to attend to metrical questions more fully than had hitherto been

done, Prof. Jurenka's book merits our consideration. To quote his own words: 'my edition, although my chief energies were devoted to criticism of the text, is not a critical one in a narrow sense' (p. xvi. of Introduction). Thus an accurate representation of the Papyrus, the statement of its errors and variants need not be looked for; but in the most important cases the reading of the Papyrus is stated with precision. Mr. Kenyon's work will thus have to be referred to in general; further study how-



ever has revealed sometimes traces in the MS. which were not visible even to his practised eye, and here Jurenka marks an advance. The literature of the subject (to May, 1898), pre-eminently, we notice, the *Classical Review*, he has used with praiseworthy diligence. Prof. Jurenka embarks on his task with a touch of the *furor biographicus* which leads him into extravagance when speaking of Bacchylides' importance. He holds that the poet is (Preface, p. xii.) 'ein meister in der Behandlung der Sprache,' and supports this by an illustration: 'wie neckisch ist im sechsten Liede das Wortspiel Λάχων λάχε, wie prächtig der Ausdruck στεφάνοις ἐθείρας νεανίας βρνόντες, wie malerisch ἀμπελοτρόφον Κέον, wie innig die Ansprache Ἀριστομένειον ὃ ποδάνεμον τέκος! Und all dieser Reiz auf engstem Raume!' One might suppose hastily that the last sentence was 'writ sarcastic,' for not one of the four 'beauties' here so fulsomely praised (certainly in the case of the first and third) is beyond the reach of the veriest Dichterling. The sobriety of Prof. Inama's judgment (as quoted on p. viii.) is in marked contrast with this: while the citation also with apparent approval of Desrousseaux (Preface, p. ix. note 25) in a contrary sense seems to show that Jurenka's admiration 'outstripped the pauser' consistency.

Before leaving the Preface attention must be drawn to a peculiar slip on the part of the editor. In discussing the respective claims of Bacchylides and Pindar to be the more creative (schöpferisch) he makes this statement: 'Übrigens, Schule hat auch Bakchylides gemacht: Apoll. de synt. (fr. 52, Bgk.<sup>4</sup>) καθὼς ἔχει τὸ "ἀρίσταρχος Ζεὺς" παρὰ τοῖς περὶ Βακχυλίδην'. Now we should be glad of further evidence of our poet's influence than the transmittence of one epithet and that a poor one to others less fortunate in their powers of invention even than he: but Prof. Jurenka must be bold indeed if he has any confidence here that *οἱ περὶ Βακχυλίδην* means anything more than 'Bacchylides' himself, as usual in grammarians' Greek. The 'school' of Bacchylides then may be considered for the present as visionary as that of Homer.

In textual matters Prof. Jurenka is least good when most independent. One example must suffice: vv. 11-14, as he prints them of poem I. (I omit brackets):—

πολυκνῶδες κεν βαθυ-δέϊλον ἦδη μὲν γένος  
ἔπλετο, καρτερήχειρ Ἀργεῖος ἀγῶνα λείοντος  
θυμολοοῖο ποτ' εἴγ' ἀχρεῖος οὐ μῶλοι μάχας.

Here one does not know which to admire most: the construction *κεν—ἔπλετο* when to all appearance there is no place for an *Irrealis*, the position of *μὲν*, and of *εἴγε*, and again of *οὐ* after *ἀχρεῖος* (with which it is to be coupled), or finally the excellent chiasmus of *ἀγῶνα* with *μῶλοι, μάχας* with *ἀχρεῖος* (to say nothing of *θυμολοοῖο*, and that from an editor who at ii. 3 assails a conjecture of Housman's with 'Kakophonisch'). I do not repent of my own reconstruction (*C.R.* vol. ii. p. 450) and observe that my *ἐλαφρὸς* v. 14 (Kenyon *ἐλαφροῖς*) is adopted tacitly by Jurenka usually most scrupulous in his acknowledgments. The editor's suggestion of *ἐκ χθῆς* (for the *ἦδη* of his text) in v. 11 will commend itself to no one. At ix. 8 (Kenyon, ix. 13) for the corrupt *ἀσαγείοντα* he proposes (with an 'etwa') *ἀσακτον γ' εἴντα*. With what sense? I find in L. and S. sub. voc. only 'not trodden down: Xen. *Oec.* 19, 11.' We are entitled to ask in such a case for the meaning proposed to be expressly stated. In the allied department of the supplying the lost parts of lines I observe no special felicity in the editor's suggestions, e.g. <ἐντέροις> *Ἴω φέροντα παῖδα* at xix. 28 (Kenyon, xix. 39).

The translation into German (with lines of unequal length) I am not competent to appraise: but it seems to represent but inadequately the simplicity of the original. In the metres a certain amount of help is given: our editor is (p. xviii.) 'in der Musik theoretisch und praktisch geschult.'

There are a few mechanical mistakes: p. 17, critical note on v. 29 for 13, 75 read 13, 76; at v. 90 (Kenyon, v. 188) omit the comma after *φθόνον*; at vii. 8 we have *πρεβύτατον* for *πρεσβ.*; p. 54, critical note on v. 6 read 'not the defensive <weapons>'; xvii. 55 for *πορυφείω*, read *πορυφύριαν*.

J. A. NAIRN.



GIUSSANI'S *LUCRETIUS*.

*T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura*: revisione del testo, commento e studi introduttivi, di CARLO GIUSSANI. Torino: Ermanno Loescher: 1896-1898. 9 lire, 70 c.

DR. ADOLPH BRIEGER in the Prolegomena to his text of Lucretius (Teubner, 1894) announced that Professor Giussani of Milan, 'vir imprimis doctus et acutus,' was preparing an Italian commentary on the *De Rerum Natura*. Giussani's work is now published in four volumes of much the same size and appearance as Weidmann's classical books, e.g. Classen's *Thucydides* or Bücheler's *Juvenal*. The first volume begins with two essays on Lucretius and Epicurus (pp. i.-lxxxii.); these are followed by twelve monographs, some reprinted from Italian journals, on difficult or disputed points of the Epicurean system. Each of the other three volumes, of about 300 pages, gives the text of two books of Lucretius with notes at the foot of the page; some preliminary observations on the text are prefixed to the second volume.

Prof. Giussani everywhere expresses a high appreciation of Brieger, and believes that Brieger's edition marks a new departure and an advance in Lucretian criticism. The main principles in which they agree, and of which, in their judgment, the previous editors did not take sufficient account, are these: (1) for the right interpretation of Lucretius, it is essential to ascertain the meaning of the extant portions of Epicurus' own writings; (2) Lucretius' poem was published after his death in a much less perfect state, in all its parts, than Lachmann supposed. Hence on the one hand, the new school of critics spend much pains on the interpretation of Epicurus' text; on the other, in dealing with the text of Lucretius, they differ widely from Lachmann, Bernays, and Munro: they are more chary of verbal emendation but much bolder in marking *lacunae* in the text, transposing paragraphs, and indicating by various typographical devices double recensions and other marks of incompleteness in the poem.

That Epicurus does throw light on Lucretius is true, though it is also true that the pure and perspicuous Latin of the disciple alone makes it possible to decipher much of the crabbed jargon of the master. Brieger and Giussani have both done good service in this direction.

But they are somewhat apt to speak as if the study of Epicurus began with them. That this is not so, might easily be shown from Bernays' commentary which Giussani knows but hardly appreciates highly enough, or from Munro's: one of the latter's most brilliant feats of interpretation, his explanation of the parts of the atom (i. 599-634), was based on the account of Epicurus. And the study of Epicurus has been made much easier since Munro's time by the publication of Usener's edition (1887).

The second principle rests on a fairly well attested fact; but it is a dangerous weapon in the hand of an injudicious critic, who forces his own logic on the poet. It has resulted, for one thing, in a remarkable increase of *lacunae*: Lachmann recognised 8 of these in the poem, Bernays 16, Munro 29, and Brieger not less than 70. When one considers the principles on which Brieger admitted a *lacuna*, e.g. after i. 840, one's only feeling is astonishment at his moderation: he might easily have found double the number. Giussani shows more tact and discretion than Brieger in this and in other matters: thus, for Brieger's numeration, that *inextricabilis error* in which the very inventor of it was entangled, he substitutes that of Bernays whose text is chiefly used in Italy.<sup>1</sup>

Giussani's purpose is to explain the meaning of Lucretius as accurately and fully as possible, not specially for 'filologi' but for 'il pubblico colto e studioso in generale.' Whatever may be the case in Italy, such a book will hardly be read in England save by professed scholars. He often indulges in a little good-humoured satire at the expense of philologers: thus on *obit* (iii. 1042) he speaks of Lachmann's 'dotta e lunga nota confutata dal Munro in una nota dotta e lunga,' and gives no account of the controversy. Occasionally, the laugh is on the other side: in v. 989 he proposes and indeed inserts in the text *labantis* for *lamentis* of MSS., *labentis* of Lachmann and others; and the note below makes the hypothesis of a misprint impossible. Brieger's own hexameter endings, *crustae furentibus auris* (v. 410), and *speciesque ponenda* (vi. 83), do not reappear in this text. But such things should be reformed altogether: a new school of criticism should not make

<sup>1</sup> The numeration of Munro is followed in this notice.

false quantities a plank in its platform, or reactionaries will be reminded of Lachmann's account of Creech—'in philosophia explicanda sane diligens sed linguae Latinae imperitissimus.' Giussani is not *imperitissimus*, but he is not strong on the philological side: in questions of metre, grammar, and usage his contributions are not important, but in the other matters in which he is specially interested, his book is a solid and valuable contribution to the study of the poem.

His text (to leave *lacunae* and transpositions out of account for the present), has some unsightly errors like that mentioned above, but is in general sensible and satisfactory. He proposes very few emendations of his own and is often content to retain the MS. reading where others have abandoned it. He speaks of his edition as more conservative in this respect than Brieger's, which it certainly is; but when he adds that Brieger's is more conservative than Munro's, he seems to be quite wrong. In Books i. and v., Giussani retains the MS. reading in 21 places where Munro alters it, and alters it in 22 places where Munro retains it. In the same books, Brieger retains the MS. reading in 12 places where Munro abandons it, and alters it in at least 60 places where Munro keeps the text. If these two books are fairly representative, it appears that Giussani and Munro are about equally conservative, while Brieger, compared with either of them, is revolutionary. It will be observed that almost all the emendations in Brieger's text are politely declined by Giussani. In many cases where he defends the text, Giussani is, I think, right: e.g. *possint* (i. 566), *avidam* (v. 201), *queat* (v. 545), *lidebant* (v. 1001). When he tries his hand at emendation, he is not seen at his best: the change of *quae* to *quod* (i. 356) is a mere corruption caused by mistaking the meaning of *quod*; the same mistake occurs at l. 335. It may be noticed that the verses which Lachmann and others have expelled, here and there, from the text as the comments of a *lector philosophus*, e.g. i. 334 and 454, are restored by Giussani following Brieger. The former states the rule several times with the emphasis of italics: *nel testo lucreziano, quale c'è arrivato, non ci sono che versi di Lucrezio*. But the principle is not consistently maintained: iii. 475 is struck out as an interpolation. But if a reader could insert this verse in the archetype of all our MSS., how is it certain that Lucretius wrote i. 454 or v. 1344-1346, of which passages the first is doubtful Latin and the second undoubted nonsense?

The Commentary is probably the most voluminous ever written on Lucretius. It includes a full account of all disputed readings, there being no separate *apparatus criticus*; it has a good deal of illustrative matter taken generally from the stores of Munro; but it is chiefly taken up with a rigorous examination of the precise meaning and logical connexion of each paragraph of the poem. Here we find the reasons set forth at length for all the *lacunae* and transpositions marked in the text, and a full discussion of similar proposals made by other scholars. Giussani is remarkably well read in Lucretian criticism since Lachmann: no book, review article, or programme, in German, French, or English, seems to have escaped him. Now it is impossible for an editor of Lucretius to have read too much; but it certainly injures his own commentary, if he is unwilling to ignore what is not worth notice. No theory is too absurd for Giussani to mention: he does not accept the absurdities, but he takes up his own space and the time of the reader by refuting what needs no refutation:—for instance a Teutonic theory, based on the obsequious language of Lucretius to Memmius, that the poet was a freedman; or another proposal to begin a verse of Lucretius with the words *alte citi (et taciti MSS. ; solliciti Bentley and others)*. In such cases, the only proper treatment is that suggested by my uncle Toby for the early work of the great Lipsius. Giussani complains more than once of Munro's '*singolare noncuranza per gli studi lucreziani tedeschi a lui contemporanei*'; if he had a reasonable share of this indifference himself, his book would make less demands on the patience of his readers. Nor has he any power of putting a point briefly: thus on ii. 757-794 he states a view as to the connexion of the argument; Mr. Housman has put forward practically the same view in the *Journal of Philology* (xxv. p. 236) and explains his meaning clearly in 20 lines; Giussani needs 120 of much smaller print to say the same thing. A well-read, ingenious man might talk so about Lucretius, and his talk would be most interesting; but a book should be written with more terseness, more reserves, more revision of first thoughts. The proof sheets too should have had more revision: the text is not free from errors, and the notes are full of misprints, especially in Greek words. But the reader who perseveres will find much to reward him; for the writer is clearly a man of acute intellect, good taste, and good temper, and his commentary has

two supreme merits: it grapples honestly with real difficulties, and it shows everywhere a keen appreciation of poetry. The notes on i. 467 and v. 1186-1193 will give an idea of his power in both respects. It is interesting to note that he explains two obscure allusions (*papaveris haustus* ii. 453; *membris incussam cretam* iii. 382) by a reference to the games of Italian street-boys: such conservatism is there in that department of life.

But perhaps the best part of the book is the first volume. The study of Lucretius as a poet could not be better; and it is hard to refrain from quoting some of the true and beautiful things said there. The second Essay is good too. The writer professes no special sympathy with the views of Epicurus; but he believes that the historians of philosophy, especially Zeller, have not done justice to the consistency, at least, of the Epicurean system; and he defends this position with power and eloquence. The monographs which follow are really an essential part of the commentary, and deal with special points which required fuller treatment: e.g. the sources from which Lucretius drew; his ambiguous use of *inane*; the distinction between *συμβεβηκότα* and *συμπετόματα*; the constitution and properties of the atom; the kinetics of the atomic theory; the connexion between the *clinamen* and free-will; the psychology of Epicurus with especial regard to the fourth element of the soul; the material constitution of the Epicurean gods; the origin of language. To state here the author's conclusions on any one of these points would take up too much space; but I believe that almost every difficulty in the system which puzzles the attentive student and of which he finds no solution in the commentaries, is clearly recognised and acutely discussed in this part of Giussani's work. He has a remarkable power of explaining difficult points by illustration; a good instance will be found in the study of the Epicurean gods.

Lastly, something must be said of the transpositions and *lacunae* marked in the text. There are a number of innovations of this kind, and Giussani himself attaches much importance to this part of his work. He finds 57 *lacunae* in the poem, of which 7 are in the first book, apart from the *lacuna* after l. 1093 which is established by MS. evidence and is due to a torn page in the archetype. Of the *lacunae* indicated by Munro, he retains those after ll. 599, 1013,

1114, and rejects those after ll. 188, 873, 1084; and he marks additional *lacunae* after ll. 79, 524, 547 and 634. In each case he gives his reasons at great length for the reader to judge of. That Lucretius wrote the paragraphs which prove the *simplicitas*, *soliditas*, and *aeternitas* of the atoms (i. 503-597), exactly as they stand in the MSS., is hard to believe; and the connexion Giussani gives by means of the double *lacuna* and some transposition might be a possible arrangement: but to my mind at least it does not carry conviction. Transposition is a thankless task: it seldom carries with it the *παραβάτης* of a really good emendation, and the transposer is generally the only person convinced of the obvious truth of his alteration, astonished though he may be at the blindness of the rest of the world. Munro was very proud of his transposition of i. 998-1001, and was convinced he was right; then Dr. Maguire wrote a paper in *Hermathena* to prove that the passage was exactly in place where it stands in the MSS.; now comes Giussani, who thinks Munro's arrangement 'poco felice' and transfers the verses to a quite different place. The facts suggest an obvious moral. There seems to be some reaction in Germany against this method of treating Lucretius: Heinze, in his recent edition of the 3rd book will have no *lacunae* and no transpositions. The introduction to the poem is transposed a good deal in Giussani's text: it runs 1-43, 62-79, *lacuna*, 136-145, 50-61, 80-135. This order is, I believe, more natural and more logical; if it stood in the MSS., it would be absurd to alter it; but is it certain that Lucretius adopted it? These are wise words which often recur in this commentary: 'non incombe alla critica di fare quello che non ha fatto Lucrezio'; and again, 'bisogna evitare il pericolo di correggere il poeta'; and they admit of a wider application than their author gives them.

In spite of prolixity and some philological deficiencies, this book is of value and importance to students of Lucretius. It is both acute, and original; it serves in many places to supplement, in a few to correct, Munro's edition, which remains, what it was called fifteen years ago by a competent judge, 'l'instrument le plus sûr et le plus complet pour pénétrer dans l'intelligence du texte de Lucrèce.'

J. D. DUFF.

PALMER'S *HEROIDES* OF OVID.

*P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroïdes, with the Greek Translation of Planudes.* Edited by the late ARTHUR PALMER, Litt.D. pp. lx, 542. 21s. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1898.

THIS last book of Palmer's, which he left half written at his death, has been finished by his colleague and successor Mr Purser. Palmer himself had brought his work to the end of ep. xiv, written most of the commentary on xv–xvii, and thrown together several notes on xviii–xxi: Mr Purser has completed the commentary, prefixed an introduction of fifty pages, and added a transcript of Bentley's conjectures from the British Museum. It was against the grain and only at Palmer's urgent and repeated request that he undertook a labour somewhat foreign to his tastes: he withholds his own name from the title-page and says that indulgence may fairly be claimed for his attempt. No indulgence is needed: Mr Purser is more industrious than Palmer, and has finished the task sooner than Palmer would have finished it; his notes are more accurate than Palmer's, and in several places he has corrected Palmer's errors: we owe him nothing but gratitude for his modest and self-sacrificing diligence. One fault Mr Purser has, and he ingenuously confesses it: he is a conservative critic. Now conservative critics are impulsive folk, and apt to leap before they look; and two or three of Mr Purser's defensive operations may be said to do more honour to his heart than to his head. One note, on xix 115, he withdraws in the corrigenda, quite in Palmer's own style; another, his championship of xviii 76 'per mihi cedentes nocte ferebar aquas,' is a good instance of the way in which conservative critics, instead of letting a difficulty sink into their thoughts, endeavour to beat it away from the surface of their mind with words (a straw will show how the wind blows: he remarks on Bentley's conjecture *sponde* that it is 'surely a very mild word to express the feat of a daring and ardent lover,' evidently construing it with *ferebar*); and he upholds as genuine the couplet v 25 sq. containing 'littera scripta,' in order I suppose that Mr Ehwald's noble verse x 106 'strataque Cretaam belua strauit humum' may not be left alone in its glory.

The novelty of this edition is that it makes public the Greek translation executed

by Planudes in the 13th century and preserved in two MSS of the 15th. Planudes translated a MS belonging to the same class as most MSS of the *heroides*, but standing above the average of that class. Mr Purser says on p. l that it agrees with P against the other MSS in many cases; but this is not so, and the examples which he cites are mostly cases where it does *not* agree with P *against* the other MSS but in company with some or even most of them. Its chief services to the text are these: at iii 44 'nec uenit inceptis mollior hora meis' it confirms Lehrs' conjecture *malis* (τοῖς ὑπὲρ γρημύνουσιν κακοῖς), at vii 136 'et nondum nati funeris auctor eris' Schlichtenhorst's *nato* (τῷ μύρω τεχθέντι), and at xvii 167 'fama quoque est oneri' Bentley's *forma* (τὸ κάλλος). At vi 47 it gives 'Dodonide pinu' for *Tritonide*: this to be sure is no improvement, but the corruption of *dodonide* through *donide* to *tritonide* was easier than the reverse. Further at iii 57 it presents the true reading *eos* which has rested hitherto on the slightest authority. Some false readings too it indicates, which seem to be found in no extant MS: Palmer and Mr Purser have detected most of these, but there are still a few to add, such as iii 55 *dotata* MSS, ἀποδομένη Plan. = *donata*, vi 49 *uillo...aureo* MSS, χρυσῷ τιμν Plan. = *ullo...auro*, xiv 125 *defunctaque uita corpora* MSS, καὶ τὸ χρεῖον λειτουργήσαν τὸ σῶμα Plan. = *fato*. What Planudes wrote has of course been sometimes corrupted by his copyists, and Palmer has removed a good many errors with the help of the Latin. Here is a striking example: xix 151 ἦνεγκε δὴ καὶ φῶς ἡ γηραιά μοι τροφός stands for *sternuit* (or *stertuit*) *et lumen*: Palmer points out that Planudes wrote merely ἔρεγκε δὴ καὶ φῶς, and ἡ γ. μ. τ. is an interpolation consequent on ἦνεγκε. There are also many blunders of Planudes' own: ii 143 *nec matura* he renders γηραιὸς πρέποντι θανάτῳ.

Among the critics who have emended Ovid's *heroides* since the time of Heinsius the first place belongs to Bentley, the second to Palmer, and the third to Madvig: van Lennep and Merkel may dispute for the fourth. The list of Palmer's emendations which I should call certain or nearly so, iv 86 *militia*, vi 55 *iuui* (to Palmer's examples add Val. Fl. i 376 Amphitryoniaden Tegeneo limine Cepheus | iuuit), vii 152 *resque*, xiii 63 sq. deleted, xv 7 *Elegiae*, xvi 38 *vulnus*,



xvii 260 *cunctatas*, xviii 203 *uti*,—perhaps I ought to add iv 137 *peccemus*,—is not indeed a long one: it will not compare with what he effected in Propertius or even in Bacchylides. But in Propertius, where his achievement equalled Baehrens' and surpassed Lachmann's, there was much more to be done; and as for Bacchylides, skimming the first cream off a new-found author is only child's-play beside gleaning after Bentley over a stubble where Heinsius has reaped. There is much to censure in this edition, so I begin with this tribute: no critic of the century has purified the text so much, and no critic but Madvig so brilliantly. And since Palmer's death was not noticed in this *Review* I will say more. In width and in minuteness of learning, in stability of judgment, and even in what is now the rarest of the virtues, precision of thought, he had superiors among his countrymen and contemporaries: in some of these things many excelled him, some excelled him far, and Munro excelled him far in all. But that will not disguise from posterity and ought not to disguise from us that Palmer was a man more singularly and eminently gifted by nature than any English scholar since Badham and than any English Latinist since Markland.

Then why, both at home and abroad, was he less esteemed than many of his inferiors? Not only nor perhaps chiefly because the classical public in England has not even yet relinquished that false standard of merit which it adopted after 1825, nor because the great North-German school of the nineteenth century has begun to decline and has not begun to find out that it is declining, but through his own fault. His talent, like that of Heinsius, resided in felicity of instinct: it did not proceed, like Madvig's, from the perfection of the intellectual power. Now the class which includes Heinsius includes also Gilbert Wakefield; and Palmer's rank in the class is nearer to Wakefield than to Heinsius. His inspiration was fitful, and when it failed him he lacked the mental force and rightness which should have filled its place. His was a nimble but not a steady wit: it could ill sustain the labour of severe and continuous thinking; so he habitually shunned that labour. He had no ungovernable passion for knowing the truth about things: he kept a very blind eye for unwelcome facts and a very deaf ear for unwelcome argument, and often mistook a wish for a reason. No one could defend more stubbornly a plain corruption, or advocate more con-

fidently an incredible conjecture, than Palmer when the fancy took him. He had much natural elegance of taste, but it was often nullified by caprice and wilfulness, so that hardly Merkel himself has proposed uncouth emendations. Moreover Palmer was not, even for his own age and country, a learned man. He read too little, and he attended too little to what he read; and with all his genius he remained to the end of his days an amateur. And these defects he crowned with an amazing and calamitous propensity to reckless assertion.

Chapter and verse for all that I have said can be found in this edition. But first for its merits. It gives a text of the *heroides* which is on the whole the best in existence, unless the text which Palmer contributed to the new *Corpus Poetarum* is better. In his choice of MSS readings he shows more sense and tact than any modern editor, and he admits more freely than any modern editor the corrections of Heinsius. To Bentley on the other hand he is almost as deaf as the deafest: that firm and piercing intellect is not easily followed by light thinkers. I gather that Palmer was somewhat mortified because his own emendations were ignored in Germany; and truly it was something of a scandal: but the Germans only behaved to him as he behaved to Bentley. The best of his own conjectures I have cited already, but others too are probable: vi 131 *hanc hanc*, ix 20 *turpis*. At xii 170 '*nec teneram misero pectore somnus habet*' his '*et tener a misero pectore somnus abit*' may be right, though it is not better than Heinsius' '*nec tener, a, miserae pectora somnus habet*'; but then he adds '*si Propertium corrigerem nec non mutarem: nam apud Sextum nec tener somnus idem ualeret ac et non tener somnus: qua figura non utitur Ovidius quantum notavi*.' It is used in verse 33 of this very epistle, where *nec notis ignibus* is shown by the sequel to mean *et ignotis* and Palmer gets into difficulties through not perceiving the fact; but his mistake is lucky if it checked him from writing *nec tener somnus*, which is nonsense: *tener* cannot mean *mitis*. At ix 66 Palmer's *patet* is nearer than *putas* to the *puet* of the MSS, but not such good sense; and the same is to be said at xxi 247 sqq., where Palmer's '*quid, nisi si cupio me iam coniungere tecum, | restat?*' well accounts for the variants *nisi cupio, nisi quod cupio*, but is not in itself so good as *quod*, and moreover the authorities which omit *quod* contain the errors *mihi* for *me* and *contingere* for *coniungere*.

vi 3 sq. hoc tamen ipsum | debueram scripto certior esse tuo. Palmer writes *debuerat*... *certius*, because he says *hoc certior esse* for *hoc scire* is not Latin. Not so fast: that no example of this construction has been adduced is true, and I will not appeal to Plaut. most. 100 'gnaruris uos uolo esse hanc rem'; but what is unique is not therefore wrong, and the next step is to look for examples of analogous constructions. These are forthcoming: just as the acc. of a neut. pron. stands here with *certior sum* = *scio*, so does it stand with *auctor sum* = *suadeo* in Cic. Att. xiii 40 2 'quid mihi auctor es?' and fam. vi 8 2 'quid sim tibi auctor.' Therefore I call it more likely that Ovid made *certior esse* govern *hoc* than that Ovid's scribes turned *debuerat certius* into *debueram certior*.

viii 47 sq. 'tu quoque habes proauum Pelopem Pelopisque parentem, | si melius numeres, a Ioue quintus eris.' P omits *habes*, so Palmer writes *per* and explains thus: 'you (Orestes), as well as he (Pyrrhus), will find you are fifth in descent from Jupiter, if you reckon carefully, through your great-grand sire Pelops and his father Tantalus. Pyrrhus, on the usual mode of reckoning, was fifth in descent from Jupiter. . . . Orestes, on the same principle of reckoning, was really sixth. . . . But he might, omitting Jupiter, be reckoned as fifth in descent: hence *si melius numeres*.' So *melius* means *omitting Jupiter*! And now what is the matter with *habes*? (1) the solecistic position of *quoque*: for Pelops was not Pyrrhus' *proauus*.' No, nor was Pyrrhus a Ioue quintus according to the 'improved' method of numeration; so *quoque* and its position are just as 'solecistic' as before. But in point of fact *tu quoque* no more implies what Palmer fancies than *et illas* in met. i 2 implies that the gods have metamorphosed Ovid's literary enterprise. (2) Tantalus could not be *proauus* to Orestes if Pelops was.' Look in the dictionary. (3) It would be a very poor boast for Orestes that the perjured Pelops and the impious Tantalus were ancestors of his.' Then why does Hermione, in the new reading as in the old, draw attention to the fact that his ancestors they were? I am not defending the vulgate, in which *melius* is corrupt, nor even impugning Palmer's *per*: I am only stripping the pretence of argument from these improvised cavils.

Then come conjectures intrinsically bad. ii 99 sq. expectem, qui me numquam uisurus abisti? | expectem pelago uela negata meo? P has *negatata meo*, whence Palmer con-

jectures *negante data*. Of the pentameter as usually read he says 'hanc lectionem idoneum sensum praeberere nego.' It gives the same sense as the hexameter. He says again 'I find nothing like *meum pelagus* in Ovid.' If he had merely taken the trouble to read this one epistle he would have found *nostra aequora* in verse 87. And what does his own *pelago negante* mean? It means 'when the sea denied the truth of your statement, which I mentioned without a hint of its falsehood four verses back, that the wind was favourable.' Tant de choses en deux mots? Oui, la langue turque est comme cela, elle dit beaucoup en peu de paroles. Allez vite où il souhaite.

xi 76 ut quatitur tepido fraxina uirga noto. P has *fraxincies* for *fraxina*: Palmer writes *fraxinus icta* and says 'hoc duo uitia habet: nam adiectiuum quod est *fraxinus* nusquam inuenitur: et tota arbor, non solum uirga una, uento quatitur.' This second cavil I throw back at *fraxinus icta*: tota silua, non solum arbor una, uento quatitur. As for the first, it is a characteristic specimen of levity assuming Rhadamantchine airs: similarly at Prop. iv 3 64 he wants to alter *carbasa lina* to *carbasa picta*, because he does not know that the phrase occurs elsewhere; and then ib. ii 31 4 he forgets to make any objection to *femina turba*.

xi 127 sq. tu, rogo, dilectae (al. proiectae) nimium mandata sororis | perfer: mandatum persequar ipsa patris. The first sentence is emended by one MS which gives *perfer* for *perfer*: compare Sen. Oed. 3 *luctifica* and *luctifera*. Palmer prefers to write 'tura rogo placitae nimium mandata sororis | tu fer,' though this is thrice as violent, and gives a frivolous sense, and makes *mandata* an adjective in the one line while *mandatum* is a substantive in the other. What is *philavria* if this is not? xiii 110 cur uenit a uerbis multa querella tuis: tens P originally, *latens* Palmer: 'uerbis latens' is to mean 'dark-worded.' Who but its author can prefer this conjecture to Dr Jackson's 'a labris . . . tuis' ?<sup>1</sup> xvi 302 sqq. o mira calliditate uirum! | 'res, et ut Idaei, mando tibi,' dixit iturus | 'curam pro nobis hospitibus, uxor, agas' writes Madvig for the *esset ut* or *esset* et of the MSS: the correction is certain in itself and rendered doubly certain by Helen's answer xvii 159 sq. 'resque domusque | et tibi sit curae Troicus hospes' ait. Palmer

<sup>1</sup> Published in the *Athenaeum* of Aug. 15, 1874, in an unsigned review, and ascribed by name to its author in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society*, vol. i. p. 377 n. (1881).

calls the passage 'locus depositus' and puts in the text, not the MS reading, not Madvig's, but a little thing of his own beginning is 'sed et,' in which neither *sed* nor *et* means anything at all. viii 19 sq. *sit socer* exemplo etc. The history of the text is convincingly explained by Madvig adu. crit. i p. 46. But the idlest notion which enters Palmer's head must have the preference; and so we read 'I think this distich originally ran *sit socer* . . . | *cui pia* . . . : that *sit* became corrupted to *si*, and that a corrector wrote ver. 20 (*nupta foret* etc.) in the margin to supply an apodosis'—there is more, but this is enough. Think of it: the scribes, to oblige Palmer, corrupt *sit* into *si*, and then, in order that no one but Palmer may know what they have done, corrupt *si* back again into *sit* 'delentque pedum uestigia cauda.'

xiv 41 sq. *ipse iacebas*, | *quaeque tibi dederam uina* soporis erant. Certainly this is almost nonsense, but it is not pure unadulterated nonsense like Palmer's *plena*. The exact reverse of *plena soporis*, 'sopor plenus erat eorum quae tibi dederam,' would have some sort of meaning.

xix 62 *pectora nunc iuncto nostra fouere sinu*. This is corrupt, since Hero is speaking and the 'pectora' are Leander's. Palmer with almost incredible absurdity writes *tosta*, as if that could stand for *frigore tosta* and as if even *frigore tosta* could be applied to Leander dripping from the Hellespont. If he had thought of *morsa* (Hor. serm. ii 6 45) he would have been conjectured that, and it would have been a trifle less ridiculous. But Merkel has excellently emended *nostro iuncta*.

xx 13 sq. *nunc quoque idem timeo*, sed *idem tamen* acius illud | *adsumpsit uires auctaque flamma mora est*. Since *timeo* makes no sense Palmer adopts Oudendorp's *teneo*: since that leaves the sequel meaningless he alters *sed idem* to *studium*. Palmer was wont to complain of the prejudice against conjectural emendation: that prejudice is partly just, and conjectures like this are the things which partly justify it. A critic who shuts his eyes and tramples doggedly across the indications afforded by *idem* . . . *sed idem tamen* . . . *illud* is not even trying to discover truth.

xx 177 sq. *quem si reppuleris, nec, quem dea damnat, amaris*, | *et tu continuo certa salutis eris*. So Palmer writes and so Planudes seems to read. And how, think you, is this to be construed? the apodosis, never mind the tense of the verbs, is to begin at *nec*: 'whom if you reject, you will

not have given your love to one whom the goddess condemns, and you yourself will at once be assured of health.'

ix 95 *redundabat: redulabat* P. 'The corruption in P clearly points to *rebellabat*.' Is it not amazing to read such a thing? xi 61 *fratri* nam *nupta futura es*. Palmer writes *fratris* and says '*fratri* edd. uett., Merkel: *sed parum Latine: si fratri legitur, nuptura es postulat*.' Then how will you emend met. xiii 25 '*Aeacus huic pater est*'? *huius* will not scan. xxi 55 *dicam: dic mihi* Bentley, *dic a!* Palmer. The interpolation has no appropriateness.

The corrections of others do not fare so well: corruptions are often defended against them, and sometimes, when they cannot be defended, they are merely maintained without defence. The most astounding example is at ix 9 sq. *cui nox...una* | *non tanti, ut tantus conciperere, fuit*. This admits two renderings, both ridiculous: 'who did not think one night worth the trouble of getting so great a son as you,' or 'who was unwilling to undergo one night in order that so great a son as you might be got.' Palmer translates without comment 'in whose estimation a single night was not thought great enough, that a son so great as you should be gotten in it.' *Great enough* is a phrase never till now applied to a night, and only applied now for the sake of ambiguity. If it means *long enough* (and length is the only dimension which a night possesses) it has no relation to the Latin. If it means *important enough* it is jargon, and the words *in it* are a surreptitious interpolation. If it means any third thing, what is that third thing? Then he proceeds 'the correction *tanta* can scarcely stand for *satis longa*.' True; but if you swallow camels you must not strain at gnats.

ii 9 sq. '*tarde, quae credita laedunt*, | *credimus: inuito nunc et amore nocens*' reads Palmer with G and most editors, and renders 'now you wrong me even in spite of my love (which is slow to believe that you could wrong me).' First he translates *inuito* correctly and finds that it makes nonsense: then he adds in brackets a translation, not of *inuito*, but of *credere nolente*, which is nowhere in the text. The true reading of course is Merkel's '*inuito nunc es amore nocens*' (*nocens* E: I should accept *inuita... amante* from the same source), 'even now I am sorry that you are guilty.'

ii 105 *utque tibi excidimus, nullam, puto, Phyllida nosti*. 'Ovid is fond of using *ut* in the sense of *since*.' Ovid is not fond of using any word in any sense which produces

such results as 'since you have forgotten me, you have forgotten me.'

iv 26 quae venit exacto tempore, peius amat. 'uenire is a uox amatoria of a woman who is willing to grant her favour to a lover.' It is; and it is therefore singularly inapplicable to a woman who is entreating one who is not a lover to grant his favour to her. *quoi venit* must be read with Faber and Heinsius and Bentley.

xiii 137 sq. Troasin inuideo, quae sic lacerimosa suorum | funera conspicient, nec procul hostis erit. 'sic: οἷσιν, αἰσῶς, just as they are, without any difficulty.' Laodamia envies the women of Troy, who, without any difficulty, will see their countrymen killed! Then in the critical note: 'quae si falso citatum est ex P ab Heinsio, et ita male ediderunt Burmann et Ehwald. *quamuis* Bentley, Lehrs, quod sententiam pessumdat.' So much the better, considering what a 'sententia' it is. *si* is right: 'Troasin inuideo, quae si...suorum funera conspicient ..., ipsa suis manibus forti noua nupta marito imponet galeam' etc.: the women of Troy, even though they see their countrymen killed, will have their husbands' company.

xvi 277 sq. non mea sunt summa leuiter districta sagitta | pectora. 'Burmann quotes Sen. contr. vii 5 (20) 9 *ut districta leui uulnere est cutis*: it would be better to read *districta* there than *destricta* here as he proposes.' I foresee that in process of time, as Ovid's modern editors extend their acquaintance with Ovid, they will come across met. viii 382 'summum *destrinxit* harundo | corpus,' where they will write *distinxit*, and x 526 '*destrinxit* harundine pectus,' where they will do the same, and xii 101 'nec tertia cuspis...ualuit *destringere* Cycnum,' where they will write *distringere*: for all these purifications of the text they will have MS authority, and when they have finished them all they had better come back to this passage and adopt the reading of the best MS in the next verse 278, '*descendit* uulnus ad ossa meum.' *Distringuntur* pectora cura, labore, officio: sagitta *destringuntur*.

xxi 205 '*si mihi lingua foret*, if I had a tongue to speak out. The reading is universally condemned, but it seems a proverbial expression.' If you ask a man what o'clock it is, and he replies that a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush, that is a proverbial expression; and yet there is something strange about it.

On the contrary at iii 39 sq. Palmer deserts the MSS when they are right and follows an error of Bentley's, whose true corrections he generally ignores. The text

is '*si tibi ab Atride pretio redimenda fuisset, | quae dare debueras, accipere illa negas*': Palmer reads *sic* because 'hypothesi locus nullus est.' This means that he does not understand the construction: it is '*negas accipere illa, quae, si redimenda fuisset, dare debueras*.' For the arrangement of the clauses compare v 6 '*ne tua permaneam, quod mihi crimen obest*?' ex Pont. i 3 2 '*qui miser est, ulli si suus esse potest*,' Prop. iv 3 2 '*cum totiens absis, si potes esse meus*.'

I have said that Palmer's choice among the MS lections is generally judicious. His chief fault here is the fault which most editors now commit and plume themselves upon committing: he treats the best MS as if it were better than it is, and sometimes prefers its authority to the thing on which authority is founded, reason. One specimen is so monstrous that I will here display it to Ζεὺς καθάριος and Ἀπόλλων ἀποτρόπαιος and anyone else whom it may concern. xv 69 sq. et, tamquam *desint quae me sine fine fatigent*, | accumulatur curas filia parua meas: that is one reading, the other is this: *desit quae me hac sine cura fatiget*. Where is the raw recruit to criticism who cannot tell which begot which? He need not know that Ovid is fond of using *sine fine* at this place in the verse; he need not even notice the disgraceful *cura . . . curas*: it is as clear as day that *sine* absorbed *fine* and the gap was then filled up with putty. Yet Palmer, like Mr Riese before him, accepts *desit . . . hac sine cura fatiget* from the best MS. To settle this case by appeals to the relative worth of MSS is to stand upon one's head: cases like this are the things by which the relative worth of MSS is settled.

The commentary—for Palmer has tried to separate inseparable things and write one set of notes on the text and another on what the text means—is a useful but not a distinguished work. For the elucidation of Ovid there is not much to be done: both he and his imitators are very straightforward writers, and their words are seldom obscure unless they are corrupt. One passage Palmer has cleared up: he was the first to commend and explain (in Mr Sedlmayer's edition) the true reading of xx 101 sq. '*Calydonis aper sic saeuus, ut illo | sit magis in natum saeua reperta parens*.' But there are few other novel interpretations, and these few are wrong. The explanation of i 27 which he proposed in 1894 in *Hermathena* is rightly withdrawn. At xx 219 he blunders strangely and is corrected by Mr Purser. About the meaning of i 90



'uiscera nostra, tuae dilacerantur opes' there have been doubts but there ought to be none: *uiscera* is in apposition with *opes* and the sense is 'your substance, which is my very life, is pillaged': see Cic. ad Q. fr. i 3 7 'cum de uisceribus tuis et filii tui satisfacturus sis quibus debes,' Timocles Stob. flor. 91 15 τὰρρύσιόν ἐστιν αἷμα καὶ ψυχὴ βροτοῖς. It is hardly credible, but Palmer translates 'our son (Telemachus) is tortured, your wealth is pillaged.'

The Germans are wont to say of some elaborate English commentaries that they are elementary; and many of Palmer's notes are only fit for a school-book. One does not pay a guinea to read '*Aesonides*: Jason was son of Aeson king of Iolcos.' The edition which Mr Ehwald is preparing for Teubner will be a more business-like as well as a more erudite performance; and although in accuracy of thought it will be inferior to Palmer's it will at least be superior in accuracy of statement. For the worst of Palmer's work is this: it contains indeed much which is true, but no assertion of his can be believed until it is verified. When, as often happens, he knows nothing about a thing, he does not try to find out something about it, nor even hold his peace, but he says anything he pleases. v 73 '*Iden*: the only passage where Ovid uses the accusative of *Ida* or *Ida*.' Why a man should make this statement, even if it were true, I cannot tell; and by merely turning to the vocabulary of proper names he could have ascertained that it is false. vi 31 '*redii*: Ovid freely lengthens -*it* in the perfect of verbs forming otherwise a tribrach.' Ovid does not. 'He evidently admitted these lengthenings in accordance with the rule which permitted poets to alter the quantity of words which otherwise could not come into the verse.' What meaning does a writer attach to his language when he says that *redii* could not come into hexameters and pentameters? does not *tenuit* come into them? Then he goes on to contradict himself by saying, what is quite true, that Ovid did not regard these 'lengthenings' as a license. x 126: the best MS has 'cum steteris turbes celsus in aure tuae': the question is whether to read *turbas* . . . *ore* or *urbis* . . . *arce*. Palmer prefers the latter and says 'in *ore* gives no sense here. in *ore populi esse* means to be talked about by the people, yet Loers, though reading in *ore*, understands it of Theseus relating his exploits.' Everyone else knows that the very best writers use in *ore* for *ante oculos*. x 142 sq. debita sit factio gratia nulla meo; | sed

nec poena quidem. So Palmer reads, and writes in the critical note '*ne PV*, Bentley, Ehwald. Sed hoc sensum prorsus evertit.' In the commentary he has learnt that this is false: 'Shuckburgh points out that *ne poena quidem* is also [also!] capable of defence;' and he quotes Mr Shuckburgh's two examples of this very common usage, not knowing any others. But still he has not lighted on the third excursus to Madvig's de finibus, nor discovered that *sed nec* . . . *quidem* is not Latin at all. xii 71 'Ovid would not elide *nescio*, which is a cretic save before enclitics as *nescioquis*.' Palmer has edited Catullus, and he, like every other editor, has printed *nescio sed* in Catullus' most famous couplet. xvi 1 '*Hypermetra*: so always in the best MSS in Latin, and so *Clytemestra*. In Greek the form is always -*μνῆστρα*.' Indeed it is not. xiv 73 '*Belide*: grandson of Belus. The Danaids are sometimes called *Belides* . . . Loers strangely confuses the two forms.' Loers does nothing of the sort: he is a better scholar than Palmer and knows, what Palmer does not know, that *Belide* from *Belus* is just as false a form as *Tantalides* from *Tantalus* or *Atrides* from *Atrous*; and he rightly defends this false form by quoting from Ibis 503 the equally false *Lycurgiden*: he might have added *Tyrrhidae* from Verg. Aen. vii 484 and *Λαγείδης* from inscriptions.

'*Abérus* is a matter in which Palmer all his life long displayed extreme frivolity: read his note on Hor. serm. i 10 92, or the tissue of blunders and irrelevancies in which he has wrapped up one grain of truth ib. ii 2 89-93. Lines plainly spurious and condemned by thoughtful critics he often accepts without demur: he retains and explains the ridiculous distich ix 37 sq. ejected by Schrader lib. emend. pp. 201 sq.; and at i 40 he labours over *dolo* because he will not recognise with Bentley that 37-40 are a stupid interpolation. But lines which no one ever suspected before or will ever suspect again he attacks in a fashion modelled on Aesop's fable of the wolf and the lamb. At v 147 and 151 he objects to *opem* and *opis* because they mean exactly what *opem* means in remed. 116. He chooses to fancy that epanalepsis is a sign of interpolation, and expels the couplet xiii 141 sq. for that and no other reason, though of course he calls it 'ineptum'; then at xii 33 he says that one form of epanalepsis is essentially Ovidian; and then the first passage he quotes to prove that statement is a passage which he and others have rightly ejected as spurious. He has justly accepted Lach-

mann's opinion that xvi-xxi are not Ovid's; though how little he understands Lachmann's arguments may be seen from the fact that when he finds Lachmann objecting to *Aethra* (Αἰθρα) and *Leda* (Λῆδα) he is fired with emulation and objects to *Ida*, pp. 323 and 436, as if Ovid or anyone else ever used or could use *Ida* to represent *Idē*: then, whereas Lachmann says that there is nothing in these epistles unlike the time of Augustus or Tiberius, Palmer thrusts them down to Nero; and having once persuaded himself that they are of the silver age he sees the silver age behind every bush. xxi 55 *solitoque tibi* 'seems to belong to the silver age': Mr Purser quotes an example from Virgil. xxi 151 *cum tamen haec dixi*: 'this use of *cum* when an unexpected result follows seems to belong to the silver age': there is hardly a better known verse in Tibullus than ii 6 14 '*cum bene iuravi, pes tamen ipse redit.*' That so inattentive a reader as Palmer should profess to know the difference between Augustan and Neronian Latin is absurd and even improper: he was not acquainted with the diction of Ovid himself. Only when half-way through this edition did he discover that Ovid employs such forms as *audibam*, xiv 36. At vii 123, where no note was wanted, he cannot refrain from writing this note: '*me coiere querentes*: even so slight a trajection as this strikes one as strange in Ovid, of whom it may in general be said as truly as of Ennius *non discedit a communi ordine uerbo-*

*rum.*' The truth is that there are two Latin authors who leave all their countrymen far behind them in the extravagant audacity of their trajections: Lucretius is one of them, and the other is Ovid.

After all these strictures I will end with a passage where Palmer has erred indeed but has erred through his acuteness. xx 187 sqq. run thus in the editions: *praeteritae ueniam dabit ignorantia culpa*: | *exciderant animo foedera lecta tuo.* | *admonita es modo uoce mea modo casibus istis,* | *quos, quotiens temptas fallere, ferre soles.* Palmer has observed, what the other editors have not observed, that *nunc* or the like is almost necessary with *admonita es* in 189; he finds in Planudes *νῦν δέ σε τούτων ἀνέμνησαν οἱ τι ἐμοὶ λόγοι καὶ νόσσημα τὸ παρόν*, and he proposes *nunc monita*. But Planudes is translating the text, not of the editions, but of the MSS; and that text is right: '*admonita es modo uoce mea cum casibus istis,*' you have *lately* (*modo*) been warned by my words *together with* (*cum*) your own mishaps.'

One page of P, containing viii 30-57, is reproduced in facsimile, and reveals a fact which collators have disguised. Mr Sedlmayer's note on 50 is '*tu a m. 2 P.*' Palmer's is '*tu om. P.*' The truth is that the second hand has written *tu* in a space which originally held or was meant to hold a word of three or four letters; so my conjecture *tibi* (*C.R.* xi p. 204 a) is confirmed by the best MS.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

#### MERRILL'S FRAGMENTS OF ROMAN SATIRE.

*Fragments of Roman Satire from Ennius to Apuleius*, by E. T. MERRILL. New York, The American Book Co., 1897. Pp. 178.

It seems to me that this book should be called *Fragments of Roman Satire and Romance*. It is true that the work of Petronius bears the technical title of *Satirae*, but a perusal of the extant fragments and the opinion of Macrobius (*in Somn. Scip.* I. 2. 8), who probably had the complete work before him, show plainly that the book was a realistic novel. As for Apuleius, probably no one would regard his *Metamorphoses* as anything but a romance. The historic relation which these two pieces of fiction bear to Roman satire makes it desirable to read them in connection with one's study of the

satirists, but it is so difficult at the best for students to get a clear conception of the nature of Roman satire that needless confusion of their views is to be carefully avoided.

The editor has adopted without change Vahlen's text for Ennius, Müller's for Lucilius, Riese's for Varro, Bücheler's for Petronius, Seneca, and the *Testamentum Porcelli*, and Eyssenhart's for Apuleius. If the book had appeared a few months later the editor would have had the benefit of van der Vliet's text for the *Metamorphoses*. Even under the circumstances, perhaps, it would have been wise for him to adopt some of the excellent emendations of van der Vliet, Rohde, Koch, and others published in the *Rhein. Mus.*, *Revue de Phil.*, and else-

where during the thirty years which have elapsed since the appearance of Eyssenhardt's edition.

Professor Merrill's edition does not contain notes, but prefixed to each fragment is a brief summary which presents in an admirable way the thought and spirit of the original.

The selections have been made with judgment, although naturally each reader is likely to regret the omission of some of his favourite passages. The present writer, for instance, is grieved not to find among the extracts from Petronius the naïve description of Trimalchio and Fortunata contained in chaps. 37-8, Trimalchio's discussion of Corinthian vases in chap. 50, the Homeric encounter between Bargates and Eumolpus in chaps. 95-6, and the story of the matron of Ephesus in chaps. 111-12. The last omission is the more to be regretted, not merely because of the celebrity of the story, but also because it is a typical Milesian tale and a study of it throws a deal of light upon the origin of the realistic romance. In the case of the *Metamorphoses* the editor has selected the portion which every student should read, viz., the story of Cupid and Psyche, but one cannot help wishing

that the prescribed limits of his book had allowed him to add the episode of Lucius's valiant encounter with the three inflated wine-skins (ii. 32-iii. 12), which illustrates remarkably well the skill of Apuleius in story telling, and gives one a more nearly correct idea of the nature of the whole romance than the Cupid and Psyche story does. I have noticed the following misprints: p. 47, fragm. 17 *caras* for *curas*, pp. 89-90 omission of section numbers, p. 141, line 5, *fugittis* for *sagittis*, line 7, *prorfus* for *prorsus*, p. 171, line 29, *ascultatu* for *auscultatu*, and p. 175, line 32, *conseo* for *censeo*. Professor Merrill by his work has put students of Latin under a two-fold obligation. They will for the first time have the fragments which are essential in studying the development of Roman satire collected in a single volume, and they will have convenient access to a number of the most interesting readable passages in Petronius. I for one feel that the book will accomplish a valuable purpose if it helps to rescue Petronius from the strange neglect into which he has fallen in these latter days.

FRANK F. ABBOTT.

*The University of Chicago.*

#### TOZER'S ANCIENT GEOGRAPHY.

*A History of Ancient Geography*, by H. F. TOZER: with Maps (pp. 1-387). Cambridge University Press. 1897. 10s. 6d.

MR. TOZER's volume covers the same ground as the late Sir E. Bunbury's well-known *History of Ancient Geography*, and the author does not seek to disguise his obligations to his predecessor. But the great size of Bunbury's *History* is its weakness as well as its strength, and it suffers the fate of most great works: everybody admires it, some people consult it, but few have the energy or the time to read it through. And its elaborateness carries with it the further disadvantage of obscuring the gradual process of development which it is the object of a history of geography to unfold. Mr. Tozer has, therefore, done a valuable service in giving us a shorter *résumé* of the subject adapted to the requirements not only of classical students (who have need of a connected view of it) but also of that growing class of general readers who, without being

special students, have an interest in the story of the gradual advances made by the ancients in knowledge of the earth's surface and of the successive attempts of geographical science to systematise the knowledge gained.

Few scholars are better qualified than Mr. Tozer, whether by actual travel in the lands of the Levant or by long devotion to the study, to undertake this task; and we may at once express our opinion that he has produced an eminently readable and serviceable book. The size of the volume is not formidable, and its low price puts it within the reach of everyone. The character of the book and the wide range of subjects treated will be best understood from a brief review of its contents, which will, we hope, have the effect of inducing many people to read it who have not yet done so.

In an introductory chapter the author deals with such topics as the advantages of the Mediterranean in early times for the speedy development of intercourse between the various peoples living on its shores or

in its neighbourhood, the earliest settlements and selfish protectionist policy of 'that wonderful race,' the Phoenicians (to whom we shall presently return), the special qualifications of the Greeks and the suggestive character of their country for the study of geography, and the great eras in the history of the science. The next four chapters go over the familiar ground of Homeric Geography (c. II., where there are some good remarks on primitive trade-routes and the amber and tin trade), the advance in knowledge caused by the spread of Greek colonies over the Mediterranean and the Euxine (c. III.), the beginnings of mathematical geography and early speculations about physical phenomena in Ionia, together with an account of the first treatise on Geography, the *Periodos* of Hecataeus of Miletus (c. IV.), and lastly, the contributions made to geography by Herodotus (c. V.). On such well-worn themes the classical student will not expect much fresh information; but the author handles his wealth of material with judgment and produces a lucid narrative.

In the following chapter (VI.) the reader will find much interesting reading about less familiar subjects such as the early fifth-century Carthaginian expeditions of Hanno down the west coast of Africa, by the island of Herne, Cape Cantin, the Wady Draa, the Senegal, the islands in the Bay of Bissagos (where the explorers were greatly alarmed by the 'torrents of fire' caused by the native custom of burning the dry grass to produce good crops the following year), and southwards to Sherboro Sound and Macauley Island with its Gorillas; and the following expedition of Himilco to the west coast of Europe, which resulted in the discovery of the huge masses of tangle called the Sargasso Sea, near the Azores. The chapter concludes with a detailed account of the Retreat of the Ten Thousand, which is illustrated by a good map and has a certain freshness of colouring derived from the author's own travels in these distant highlands.

Then follows a description of Alexander's Eastern expedition and its enormous effects on the development of geography (c. VII.); and an account of the progress made under his successors,—in regard to the countries near Egypt, through the public spirit of the Ptolemies: in respect of India, by the studies of Megasthenes, the Ambassador of Seleucus Nicator to the Prasian Court (ca. 290 B.C.), whose work (largely surviving in Diodorus, Strabo and Arrian) is full of wonderfully

accurate information about the administration of the country, the caste-system, the religion of the Brahmins, etc.: and in regard to Britain (and probably the shores of Friesland), by the voyage of Pytheas of Marseilles, about 330 B.C. (c. VIII.).

Chapter IX. deals with the attempts made in the third century to systematise the knowledge now gained and to put it on paper in the shape of a map of the world. No one can fail to be keenly interested in Mr. Tozer's clear account of the difficulties to be overcome (after the idea of the sphericity of the earth had been reached) in the construction of a scientific map,—the determination of parallels of latitude and meridians of longitude,—and of the great advance made towards a solution of them by Eratosthenes, the librarian of the Alexandrian Museum (240-196 B.C.). Physical and Historical Geography (c. X.) were later developments. The former begins to be cultivated about the middle of the second century before Christ, and continues to engage interest down to the Augustan age. Much interesting information about it is collected in this chapter,—the discovery of the causes regulating the movement of the tides, the elaboration of the older division of the Winds, observations on the courses of rivers and the formation of alluvium, the establishment of a connection between earthquakes and volcanic action, and so on. Historical Geography (defined as the study of the influence of natural conditions on the history of nations), first hinted at by Aristotle, is developed by Ephoros and more fully by Polybius, 'the historian of the Decline and Fall of Greece' (as Freeman happily calls him), who, writing as he did after the Roman conquest, could attain a wider outlook than was possible for those who knew only the petty politics of the several Greek states. It is noteworthy that Polybius, a traveller himself, reached the modern point of view that travel is an 'essential part of the equipment of the historian and geographer' (p. 210).

In discussing the gain which accrued to geography from the Roman conquests (c. XI.), Mr. Tozer is careful to point out the importance to science of the official measurements of distances along the roads and of Agrippa's wall-map exposed to view in the *Porticus Octaviae*, whence were derived the Itineraries. The other chapters deal with the life and work of Strabo (c. XII.); geography under the early Empire (c. XIII.), including Pliny's *Historia Naturalis*, Bks. II. and III.—VI. (which, as he rightly remarks,



is mainly of a statistical nature, but valuable for us because based on official records), and the important *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*; the system of Frontier Defence and military roads with an account of the *Itineraries* (c. XIV.); Estimates of mountains in ancient times and Mountain Telegraphy (c. XV.),—he might have included a reference to Byzantine telegraphy; and lastly, Ptolemy and later geographers.

It is beyond our scope to criticise the book in detail, nor is it necessary. We shall content ourselves with selecting a few points. The least satisfactory part of the book is that dealing with prehistoric times. We regret to find the author serving us up, with perfect confidence, the old story about that 'wonderful race,' the beneficent and adventurous Phoenicians, 'the first depositaries of geographical knowledge in the Mediterranean' who had 'long before the dawn of Greek history established their trading-stations at various points on the shore of that sea and even on the confines of the ocean' (p. 4), who had been to Tarshish or Tartessus<sup>1</sup> [mentioned in *Gen. X.*, 4, and in Solomon's time (1000 B.C.) in connexion with the navy of the king of Tyre (pp. 7, 16)] long before any Samian mariner, 'the only sea-faring people of the Homeric age' (p. 33), and so forth. Surely Mr. Tozer cannot be unaware that the whole body of archaeological evidence discovered since the time of Curtius (*Preface*, p. vi.), proves (to unbiassed minds) the groundlessness of the traditional view about the Phoenicians. Further, if it be true that the transmarine trade of Phoenicia was established in the misty ages, before 1000 B.C., how comes it that all the best sites in the Mediterranean, the Aegæan, and the Euxine (mentioned in c. III.) are occupied by Greek colonies? Why did the Phoenicians pass by Cyrene to go to Carthage, why did they overlook the best parts of Sicily (within sight of Africa), and crowd into a corner on the north-west? Why did they neglect to occupy Massalia, the terminus of the overland route across Gaul? Why indeed! because they were all occupied already. And if Tarshish be (as we believe) not Tartessus, but Tarsus! But we need not labour the point. If we place the Phoenician colonizing activity about the 8th century we shall be nearer the truth.

Again, in dealing with the spread of the Greek colonies the author might have indicated that the traditional dates are not

trustworthy. They all depend on reckonings by generations, as Mahaffy and Beloch have shown. For our own part, we believe they are all too late. At least, the colonies were established before Phoenician activity begins.

The volume is supplied with ten maps: yet there is something to be desired in this respect. For instance, nearly two pages are devoted to a description of the course of the Royal Road; yet the reader will look through the maps in vain to find the situation of the various places mentioned. Where is Tavium or Melitene or Samosata? The important names on the road could easily have been inserted in the very inadequate map facing p. 299. And this leads us to another point. This map is meant to illustrate the roads of the Roman Empire, and therefore care should have been taken to insert, if possible, every name given in the text, as well as the modern equivalents. We have a strong objection to an ancient map which does not give the modern names of places: they are an enormous help to the reader in finding his bearings, and they supply a convenient test of the accuracy of the map. Had this method been followed, it would have prevented the mistake of placing Gordium where Pessinus ought to be (map facing p. 123). The incompleteness of this map is shown by the fact that in the whole interior of Asia Minor only one solitary town is indicated (Ancyra) and not even a single river. How can a reader understand the course of a road that wends its sinuous way over a blank space?

The description of the western roads is better than the eastern. Under the section 'Main Roads through Asia' (p. 305), no indication is given of the fact that the important roads of the early and the later Empire are quite different; and the only road described is one which was not of great importance until Nicomedeia became the capital of the East. After giving a detailed description of the defences of the Upper Euphrates, the author should surely have indicated on the map both the military posts and the roads connecting them, without which the description is unintelligible to the ordinary reader, for whom the book is intended.

In describing the *Itineraries* (pp. 306–312), it would have been well if some definite information had been given as to their value as geographical authorities, whether they have become much corrupted, whether the numbers are reliable or not, and so forth. We are aware that short views are necessary

<sup>1</sup> The italics are mine.

in a work of this size; but room might have been found for such information in the six-and-a-half pages devoted to this subject.

The discussion of Ptolemy's geographical treatise is lacking in one respect, that it does not consider the value of the work for 'descriptive and political' geography.<sup>1</sup> Is its value equal for all countries and provinces alike? Did Ptolemy probably use different authorities of different dates (as Pliny did, p. 264), and make serious errors in trying to combine their accounts? Its value is in reality very different for different parts, and the second question should apparently be answered in the affirmative. After all, this side of Ptolemy's work is the

most important for the student of ancient life. We await with great expectation the publication of Ptolemy's Maps, recently discovered by Prof. Jelić. If the report communicated to the *Classical Review* for February be correct, the discovery may necessitate some alteration of current views about Eratosthenes and Ptolemy.

These criticisms are made in the hope that they may be considered in view of a second edition, not from any wish to detract from the general merits of the volume, which (as we have already said) is both very useful and very readable, and well worth perusal by any one who wishes to gain a connected view of the progress of geographical knowledge in ancient times.

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

<sup>1</sup> The account of the coast of Britain is examined, but there the majority of the localities mentioned are merely the mouths or estuaries of rivers (p. 348).

#### THE SCANSION OF BACCHYLIDES XVII.

##### STROPHE.

##### PAEONIC.

- I. (1) ∪ : ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ||  
 (2) ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ||  
 (3) ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ||  
 (4) ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ||  
 II. (5) ∪ : ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ > |  
 (6) ∪ : ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ||  
 (7) ∪ : ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ > ||  
 (8) ∪ : ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ||  
 (9) ∪ : ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ||  
 (10) ∪ : ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ||  
 (11) ∪ : ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ||  
 (12) ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ||  
 (13) ∪ : ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ > ||  
 (14) ∪ : ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ||  
 (15) ∪ : ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ||  
 (16) ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ||

Period I. 3.5.3.5 = 16. Palinodic.

Period II. 3.4.5.2.2.2.2.4.5.3.4.4 = 40. Antithetic with epode. Distinguished by anacrusis except vv. 7, 12, 16 which end the three sections of the period.

## EPODE.

## PAEONIC.

- I. (1)  $\cup : \cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup | \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup ||$   
 (2)  $\cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup | \cup \cup ||$   
 (3)  $\cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup | \cup \cup ||$   
 (4)  $\cup : \cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup ||$  or  $\cup : \cup \cup | \cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup ||$   
 (5)  $\cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup ||$   
 (6)  $\cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup | \cup \cup > ||$   
 (7)  $\cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup | \cup \cup > ||$   
 (8)  $\cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup ||$   
 II. (9)  $\cup : \cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup | \cup \cup | \cup \cup ||$   
 (10)  $\cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup | \cup \cup ||$   
 (11)  $> : \cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup | \cup \cup ||$   
 (12)  $\cup : \cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup ||$   
 (13)  $\cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup ||$   
 (14)  $\cup : \cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup > ||$   
 (15)  $\cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup ||$   
 (16)  $\cup : \cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup ||$

Period I. 4. 3. 3. 2 (or 3) 3. 3. 4. 3 = 25 (or 26). Inverted with mesode (anacrusis) and epode.

Period II. 4. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 4. 3 = 26. Antithetic with mesode and epode, anacrusis to the mesode and epode and the second verse of the pairs of tripodies.

C. A. M. FENNELL.

## NOTES.

## HYMN TO THE DIOSKUROI, LL. 15, 16.

15 κύματα δ' ἐσπότερσαν λευκῆς ἁλὸς ἐν πελάγεσσι  
 ναῦταις σήματα καλὰ πόνου σφίσιν· οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες  
 γήθησαν παύσαντο δ' οἰζυροῖο πόνου.

L. 16 cannot be satisfactorily explained, as it stands, by any arrangement of punctuation, and recent critics have generally agreed that σφίσιν is corrupt and have sought to replace it by an accusative such as κρίσιν (Baumeister), σχίσιν (Tyrrell)—to which one might add σχῶσιν. Such conjectures, including his own σβέσιν, Mr. Allen (*J.H.S.* xviii. 32) designates as 'evidently useless stopgaps;' but, though none of them has palaeographic likelihood, they all proceed on a probable assumption as to the construction. The error is more deeply seated and extends beyond σφίσιν. I propose to read

σήματα καλὰ πόν<ων ἀπον>όσφισιν.

The recurrence of the four letters *απον* led to the accidental omission of the three syllables enclosed in brackets; *πону* was inevitably corrected to *πόνου*; and then *ναῦταις* (unnecessary to the sense) was inserted to complete the metre.

J. B. BURY.

VELLE AS AN AUXILIARY.—Karl Sittl, in his *Lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache*, p. 128, cites from Corippus' *Johannis* 6. 89 a description of

captive women; 'miserae modo matribus Afris | iam servire volunt.' The poem was written about 550 A.D. In the pseudo-Cyprianic *Exhortatio de Patientia*, p. 12, ed. Wunderer, the lxx. ἀνδριόμαι in Jeremiah ii. 25 is rendered by *confortabor uolo*, apparently a conflation of *confortabor* with *confortari uolo*. This was written about 400 A.D., and probably in Spain. Cyprian *Ep.* 6. 3 (250 A.D.), speaking of the Jewish *Tres Pueri* in the furnace, has 'addiderunt ... se... non in hoc fidere ut liberari in praesentia uellent, sed illam libertatis et securitatis aeternae gloriam cogitarent' (484. 1 Hartel). It is obvious that their trust must have been in a prospect of liberty, not in the wish for it. The use of *uolle* is in this passage a convenient substitute for a peculiarly awkward future passive of ordinary Latin; and it must have been extended, by a process of analogy, to occasions where such a circumlocution was needless, first in the passive, as in the Spanish instance, and then in the active, as in that from Corippus, where *servire volunt* is simply equivalent to *servient*. There is no reason to regard this use of *uolle* as peculiarly African; the Wallachian is the only Romance language in which it exists. Further enquiry would no doubt discover more examples.<sup>1</sup>

E. W. WATSON.

<sup>1</sup> *E.g.* Juv. x. 282 'uellet descendere' = 'descensus esset.'—Ed. C.R.

## ARCHAEOLOGY.

## ISHAM'S HOMERIC PALACE.

*The Homeric Palace.* By NORMAN MORRISON ISHAM, A.M., architect. Providence: The Preston and Rounds Company. 1898. 8vo. Pp. viii. 64. Price \$1 net.

IN this slender, broad-margined booklet Mr. Isham has attempted, he tells us, 'to gather together the main facts about the palace of the Homeric time, and to explain them by illustrations.' He hopes that his work 'will be of use to all students of the great poems, as well as to those who like to follow the progress of domestic architecture and the history of fortification.' As might be inferred from the closing words of the second quotation, the title of the book is misleading: 'The Homeric Castle' would have represented better the contents of the book as a whole. The author himself perceives this (p. 4); but he is too much under the spell of Joseph's *Paläste des Homerischen Epos*, on which a good part of his own work is quite frankly based, to be independent in the matter of title. This fact will at once suggest that Mr. Isham's work lacks originality and that he has not perfectly assimilated his materials. This is true; yet not improbably there are readers whom his rapid sketch of a most fascinating subject will stimulate, as he hopes, to consult the authorities he names—among which, by the way, M. de Ridder's article in *Bulletin de corr. hellénique* 1894, pp. 271-310, should figure side by side with Noack's. (Mr. Isham, it may be noted, does not follow Noack's spelling 'Gla.') Even the rather unclear bird's-eye views—the bird at an elevation of about a thousand feet (p. 58)—of prehistoric Greek fortifications and palaces may be found of value by some; but the book can hardly 'be of use to all students of the great poems.'

To note a few details, the author's loose use of the term 'Aryan' (e.g. at p. 22) is open to grave objections. The reference to 'freezing snows' (p. 28) seems hardly to square with the climatic conditions. Such transliterations of Greek terms as 'megaron andron,' 'dourodoke,' 'huperoon,' and the like, are not only most ugly, to say the least, but they are also needless—unless, indeed, the Greek which they represent be deemed needless or unintelligible to the reader. Mr. Isham gives no grounds for the notion

about the 'proto-Ionic shaft and capital with the upward diminution' in Mycenaean architecture (p. 38). The attempt made at pp. 31 and 58-62 to bring clearly before the mind's eye the archaic palace and castle in their original form and local setting is commendable in spirit. The author writes with true Philhellenic fervour. But it does not certainly appear that he has seen Greece.

Among other slips it is unfortunate that the translator of Schuchhardt should appear in the Bibliography as *Eugene Sellers*.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

Barnard College, New York.

## EXCAVATIONS IN ROME.

## I.

THE excavations which have been going on in the Forum since November last have yielded a considerable number of interesting discoveries. As they are still in progress, the following short account of what has been done so far must be regarded as liable to a certain amount of modification in the future.

## I.—Temple of Vesta.

The excavations have shown the existence—already suspected by Middleton (see 'The Temple and Atrium of Vesta,' extract from *Archæologia*, vol. xlix., plate opposite p. 12)—of a chamber within the podium. It was inaccessible except from above; the apertures in the concrete podium, by which the chamber is now entered, one of which Middleton (*op. cit.* p. 6) wrongly connects with the structure of the temple, were broken through in the Middle Ages, probably in order to extract building materials or to search for treasure (see Lanciani, *Ruins and Excavations*, p. 224). The W. wall has in fact been entirely removed, though its foundations are traceable. The chamber is perfectly oriented upon the points of the compass, and it may therefore be regarded as certain that the entrance of the temple faced due E, as Jordan thought (*Tempel der Vesta*, p. ix, p. 23). It measures just over eight feet square, and its walls were originally constructed of blocks of



tufa, which still remain at the corners; the space between them has been filled in with brickwork—a restoration which probably dates from the rebuilding of the temple by Julia Domna after the fire of Commodus. At the level of the upper surface of the construction in blocks of tufa, a layer of chips of white marble about two inches thick runs horizontally through the podium. This was taken by Jordan (*op. cit.* p. 11) and Auer (*Tempel der Vesta*, p. 17) to mark the line of the floor of the temple itself.

Above it the material of the concrete of the podium changes from dark brown to yellow tufa. Jordan thought that the latter was an addition of later date, and that the level of the floor of the temple never lay much above the layer of marble chips. But the brick work of the newly discovered chamber is preserved to a height of about four feet above this layer; it appears, therefore, that in the restoration of Julia Domna the podium of the temple was made just so much higher.

It seems probable that the chamber contained the 'stercus Vestæ,' which was once a year removed from the temple (Kal. Maff. 15 Jun. *C.I.L.* i.<sup>2</sup> p. 224 Festus, p. 344 Müll.: 'Stercus ex aede Vestæ xvii. Kal. Iul. defertur in angiportum medium fere Clivi Capitolini qui locus clauditur porta stercorearia,' *cf.* p. 258. Varro *L.L.* vi, 32. Ovid, *Fasti* vi. 713 'Haec (*i.e.* xvii Kal. Iul.) est illa dies, qua tu purgamina Vestæ, Tibri, per Etruscas in mare mittis aquas.') The 'stercus' probably (as Jordan, *op. cit.* p. 70, supposes) included the small portions of ashes, which were daily removed from the sacred hearth.

On the S.S.W. side of the temple some further remains of early tufa structures buried below the later ground level have been discovered (for those found in previous excavations, see Jordan, *Tempel der Vesta*, p. 23, and Tafel II). Among them in a stratum of burnt material was found a considerable quantity of fine pottery, ranging in date from the seventh to the third century, B.C.,—Aretine and Campanian ware, with fragments of black and red figured Italo-Greek vases. It is noticeable that all this pottery is here found in household use. The stratum of burnt material is traceable, very likely, to the fire of 241 B.C., for which *cf.* Liv. *Epit.* 19; Ovid, *Fast.* vi. 437; Plin. *N.H.* vii, 141.

The walls on this side are, like the chamber in the podium oriented on the points of the compass, and are probably, like the similar wall discovered in 1886 on the north side of

the temple (*Mittheilungen des Arch. Instituts, Röm. Abt.* 1886, p. 100, tav. V,E,F), parts of the Republican enceinte.

Upon the north side a brick drain was discovered in 1886, running W.N.W. At the W. end of the wall EF it is joined by two others, one coming from the direction of the temple of Romulus, the other from under the steps of the temple of Vesta. It passes close under the N. side of the temple, and here is formed of thin slabs of tufa set up vertically on end.

Upon the N.W. side of the temple a piece of rough road paving of late date has come to light; it would appear—if that were not impossible—to run straight under the temple itself, and it does not seem to belong to a pavement surrounding the podium. Is it possible that it is an approach to one of the apertures broken through the concrete of the podium, which in the case must be supposed to have been made before the burial of the Forum after 1084 (Lanciani, *Ruins and Excavations*, p. 245.)?

## II.—Temple of Divus Iulius.

The semicircular niche in the façade of this temple has been cleared out, with the result that, behind the later wall which stands in front of it, a concrete base about two feet high, in three tiers, has been discovered. The existence of something of the kind was suspected by Middleton (*Remains of Ancient Rome*, vol. i. p. 286); Jordan too (*Topographie*, vol. i. 2, 409, note 116) queries 'Hatte in der Nische die Ara gestanden?' This base stands upon travertine paving slabs about six inches thick, well laid, belonging to the earlier pavement of the Forum, and lying below the level of the later. The slabs have actually been cut away to allow of the construction of the semicircular wall, and are quite independent of, and previous to, the building of the temple. There can therefore be no doubt that the concrete base stands upon a spot so sacred that it was necessary to enclose it within the façade of the temple without disturbing it. And this must have been the spot where the body of Caesar was burnt. Dio Cassius xlvii. 18 says: ἡρώδης οἱ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ καὶ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ ἐν ᾧ ἐκέκαντο προκατεβάλλοντο, *cf.* Appian i. 4 νεὼν ἐπωκοδόμησαν τῇ πυρᾷ, *cf.* ii. 147, iii. 2. There remains the question what the base supported.

Prof. Norton, in a letter to the *Times* of Jan. 9th, held that it was the column of

Numidian marble mentioned by Suetonius (*J. Caesar* 85). Signor Borsari (*Athenaeum*, Jan. 7th, p. 25) inclines to believe that the statue of Caesar erected in the Forum by Augustus (Plin. *N.H.* ii. 93, cf. Jordan, *Topographie*, i. 2, 407, note 125), stood here: and this seems the more probable view, for it is nowhere positively stated that either the column or the altar erected on the spot, both of which we know to have been removed,<sup>1</sup> were ever re-erected. Nor does the base, resting as it does on slabs of travertine only six inches thick, which themselves appear to rest on the earth, seem capable of bearing the weight of a column twenty feet high. On the other hand, it is remarkable that in the niche were found many chips of Numidian marble, the material of which the column was, according to Suetonius, composed. It is in any case clear, however, that the base, whatever it supported, is, as we see it, a later construction. It is built of tufa concrete—not as we should expect in a work of the Augustan period, of solid blocks of stone or marble—and its three tiers are all in shape irregular polygons.

The wall which blocked up the niche is not of very late date. Richter, *Jahrbuch des Instituts*, 1889, p. 146, who considered that the niche was intended to receive the body of an emperor at the laudatio, would attribute this wall to a period at which this temple was no longer used for this purpose—at the funeral of Pertinax (Dio Cassius, lxxiv. 4) there is no mention of the Rostra Iulia—all the action takes place at the Rostra Vetera. It was not only a single block in thickness, but went further back into the niche, as the construction shows: but whether the niche was entirely filled with masonry is quite uncertain—the more so as a hole has been broken into it from the back by the spoilers of the Middle Ages.

Outside this wall is a travertine paving slab about one foot thick, lying below the level of the later pavement of the Forum area, which is not rectangular, but has its S.W. side parallel to the front of the temple of Castor and Pollux. This fact is a consequence of the difference in the orientation of the temple of Iulius from that of the adjacent buildings. It may be

<sup>1</sup> For the column see Cic. *ad Att.* xiv. 15, 'Dolabellam columnnam tollere, locum sternendum locare'; for the altar, Cic. *ad Fam.* xi. 2, 'veteranos de repouenda ara cogitare.' Gilbert (*Topographie*, iii. 117) identifies the 'ara' with the *Βαυμὸς* mentioned by Dio and Appian and the 'bustum' mentioned by Cicero, *Phil.* i. 2, 5; while Jordan, *loc. cit.*, takes the bustum to be a cenotaph, in front of which the ara stood.

noted that at the E. corner of the temple, in the embankment which supports the modern road, many more fragments of the cornice of this temple have been discovered similar to those previously known, which belong to a restoration, probably of the 4th century A.D., of which nothing is known to us from literary sources. It is this deposit of architectural fragments which gave the final impulse which has led to the determination to excavate the presumed site of the Basilica Aemilia.

### III.—Temple of Antoninus and Faustina.

The excavations in front of this temple have revealed the existence of two more steps, taking up the whole front of the temple. These steps are of brick, and large enough to take two each of the marble steps. This level, four feet lower than that previously laid bare, was reached from the Regia by three steps of travertine, each nine inches high, of unequal width. The paving stones of the road had been taken up and relaid at the higher level at the time when the level of the ground had risen. Under the road a fine cloaca in opus quadratum of tufa with large voussoirs has been discovered. On the south-east side of the steps of the temple are traces of the entrance to a chamber under them.

Between the Regia and Atrium Vestae a small system of hypocausts has been found: its connection with any of the surrounding buildings has not yet been traced out.

THOMAS ASHEY, JUN.

(To be continued.)

### MONTHLY RECORD.

#### ITALY.

*Rome.*—An inscription dating from the time of Sulla has been found in the floor of the Comitium, at the foot of the arch of Septimius Severus. It is cut on slabs of travertine, and appears to have been fixed to the official residence of the Censors. The stones were used by Diocletian or Maxentius for repairing the damages done by the fire of A.D. 283 in the pavement of the Comitium. The inscription refers to contracts made for certain public works in Rome, the exact nature of which cannot be ascertained. These works were to be executed along certain streets; and must have been very cheap, costing 100 to 119 sesterterii per foot (20 to 25s.). Most probably they were drains; Livy (xxxix. 44) mentions the work done by M. Porcius Cato and L. Valerius in draining the Aventine in 183 B.C. Two columns of twenty-four lines each remain from the inscription.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Athenaeum*, 11 March.

**Pompeii.**—An inscription has come to light with the name of M. Lucretius Decidians Rufus, which also occurs in *C.I.L.* x. 788, 789, 851, where he is described as *duumvir ter*, and also as *pontifex*. But in this inscription he is only *duumvir iterum*, and not *pontifex* at all; so that this inscription is evidently of an earlier date than those in the *Corpus*. Other recent finds at Pompeii are an ideal head in glazed porcelain, of the Alexandrine period, and a finely-executed mosaic pavement. The head is of a greenish colour, the eyes having been of a vitreous paste, inserted separately; the hair is parted and gathered in a knot at the neck. The mosaic is set in a pavement of *rosso antico* and other marbles, with a travertine slab in the centre enclosing it. It represents the bust of a young matron with wavy black hair gathered under a black band; she wears pearl earrings and a necklace with a gold and emerald clasp. The face is probably a portrait; the background is yellow.<sup>2</sup>

**Conea.**—A tumulus which was recently excavated here contained a set of artificial teeth, apparently belonging to a woman. Five teeth remained, mounted on a thin strip of gold-leaf; the place of the middle one (an incisor) had been taken by a small capsule of gold-leaf modelled in the form of the tooth, which had apparently decayed and been stopped with gold. The teeth consisted of one molar, one canine, and three incisors, from the left side of the lower jaw. In the tumulus was a fragmentary Corinthian oinochoe with a narrow frieze of figures, winged Gryphons, lions, and horsemen.<sup>3</sup>

**Pozzuoli.**—Three sculptures of some merit have been here, all of Luna marble and belonging to the Roman period. The first is a youthful Dionysos between Pan and a panther; Pan has goat's feet, and is of diminutive stature; little of the panther is left. The second is a similar group, slightly varied; the third, a Fortune with cornucopia.<sup>4</sup>

**S. Maria di Capua.**—A curious vase has recently been discovered. It is of poor clay, painted in the local style on a yellow slip with lotos-flowers and palmettes in black and purple. The vase had been used as a *cinerarium*, and was found full of burnt bones. The peculiarity is in the cover, which is composed of three conventionally-modelled ducks, their heads resting on the rim of the vase, their tails uniting above in a loop-shaped handle.<sup>5</sup>

**Tiriolo, Calabria.**—A hoard of coins of Bruttium has come to light, 731 in all. They consist chiefly of drachmae and triobols inscribed *ΒΡΕΤΤΙΩΝ* or coins of Carthage without inscription, of a date subsequent to the first Punic War; all belong to the end of the third century B.C. The chief interest of the Bruttium coins is the remarkable diversity of the symbols which they bear; the Carthaginian coins are mostly of the type with a head of Persephone and a horse.<sup>6</sup>

**Pitigliano, Tuscany.**—An interesting find has been recently made in the shape of a gold stater of Philip II., with a head of Apollo laureate to right,

and a biga moving to right on the reverse. It is inscribed *ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ*, and in the exergue is a trident (cf. Head, *Hist. Num.*, p. 196, fig. 137). This discovery shows that coins of Philip were not only current in Italy but constituted the standard of value of gold in the third and second centuries B.C. A similar coin has been found at Arezzo.<sup>7</sup>

**Vetulonia.**—Discoveries of the early Italian period continue to be made. The latest find includes among other objects five gold fibulae of great interest. The type is that with a thick bulging bow (*a navicella*) and a long foot with a sheath formed of two plates joined at right angles along their length. Two of these were identical, and these were found, with a third, in a chest of lead. These three have bands of figures along the foot, in the third example in the reverse direction to the other two; these figures are in the form of winged quadrupeds with human faces. The bows of the fibulae are decorated in a similar fashion, also with figures of dogs and patterns of volutes. The fourth example has the bow moulded in the form of a sphinx with recurved wings and long tail; on the foot of the fifth are niello designs, five greyhounds running, and diaper patterns, while on the bow are figures of dogs heraldically grouped, and various ornamental patterns. This last specimen resembles one published in the *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1894, p. 358. Among other finds from these tombs are: parts of chariots in bronze; two gold bracelets with elaborate clasps and two gold spirals; a hair-pin with globular top on which are figures of winged quadrupeds, birds, etc., in niello; two plain gold fibulae, one like those described above, the other of the 'snake' type; a necklace of 130 gold beads; a bronze incense-burner; and Roman *fascies* in iron, formed of eight rods with a double-headed axe in the centre.<sup>8</sup>

**Bologna.**—A mosaic pavement which has recently come to light in the courtyard of the Palazzo Comunale is noteworthy for its decoration. It consists of sixteen squares in four rows, divided by cable borders, each of the rows having a different pattern; in one case of small squares forming a diagonal cross, in another, quatrefoils, and in the other two, crescents with double cusps placed back to back. The mosaic is nearly ten feet square, and belonged to a private house; it dates from the second century after Christ.<sup>9</sup>

**Gualtieri, near Modena.** A bronze bust of good workmanship of the Hellenistic period has been found; it had been attached to a couch or chest. It represents a Satyr wearing an ivy-wreath, his face twisted to one side with an expression of pain.<sup>10</sup>

**Verucchio, near Rimini.** Extensive discoveries have lately been made of objects of the Villanova type. They include fibulae of the 'snake' type and others with a flat plate at the foot; bronze plates with punctured geometrical patterns (as *Conestabile, Due Dischi*, pl. 1); a curved iron dagger with patterns in bronze on the handle, a very fine specimen of the Novilara type; a palstave with circles incised all over; and numerous *ossuaria* of a primitive type.<sup>11</sup>

H. B. WALTERS.

<sup>2</sup> *Notizie degli Scavi*, April 1898.

<sup>3</sup> *Notizie degli Scavi*, July 1898.

<sup>4</sup> *Notizie degli Scavi*, Sept. 1898.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

**The Journal of Philology.** Vol. xxvi., No. 52. 1899.

*On the Composition of some Greek Manuscripts.* T. W. Allen. III. The Venetian Homer. *Tibulliana*, J. P. Postgate. *Some Notes on the Text of Lucan*, J. P. Postgate. *On the Octavius of Minucius Felix and Firmicus De Errore Profanarum Religionum*, Robinson Ellis. *The Battle of Lake Trasimene*, II. B. W. Henderson. *Orphica*, II-IV. A. Platt. *Notes on Euripides*, W. Headlam. *Fragment of a Latin-German Glossary in the Library of University College, Sheffield*, G. C. Moore Smith. *Emendationes Homericae* (Od. vi.-ix.), T. L. Agar. *Some Plautine Emendations*, W. M. Lindsay. *The Articles of Dress in Dan*, iii. 21, S. A. Cook. *Operatus and operari*, J. P. Postgate.

**Revue de Philologie.** Vol. 22. Part 4. Oct. 1899.

*Note sur un passage de l'Électre de Sophocle*, L. Parmentier. On ll. 86-91. Takes ἀπ in the philosophical sense and as the complement of φάος ἀπὸν, hence the verb in the singular. *Le règne et la mort de Poppée*, Ph. Fabia. Concluded from previous vol. [Cl. Rev. xii. 284]. Nero killed Poppaea without intending it and regretted it afterwards. The best testimony to her charm is the fact that Otho set up again her statues. *Utrum e Cerycum gente fuerit Andocides necne*, M. Niedermann. That Andoc. was of this family comes to us on the authority of Pseudo-Plutarch and we have no solid reason to doubt it in spite of the objections of Wilamowitz and others. *Plaute*, G. Ramain. In *Aulularia* 536-540 a lacuna should be marked after 538. In 539 we should probably read *quanto for aliquanto*. *Notes épigraphiques*, B. Haussoullier. (1) metrical inscr. at Constantinople. (2) An inscr. of Delphi. (3) An inscr. of Thespieae.

Vol. 23. Part I. Jan., 1899. *Le Temple d'Apollon Didyméen—Questions chronologiques*, III. B. Haussoullier. Gives the text of an inscr. as yet unpublished, which contains an account of the years 158/157 and 157/156 and lets us know the state of the works at the temple at this period. There are two appendices (1) on the door of the Tholos at Epidaurus, (2) on Vitruvius iv. 6. *Valérius Flaccus et les Barbares*, R. Harmand. Shows by exx. the originality and picturesqueness of V. F., especially in his descriptions of barbarous countries, and how he has given a new aspect to the Argonautics differing much from Apoll. Rhod. *Ad inscr. gr. insul. maris Aegaei*, III. No. 331, Ch. Michel. This inscr. belongs to Thera. The marble is in the National Library at Paris. M. confirms the hypothesis of Hiller von Gaertringen that it is contemporary with Ptolemy Philometor. *Cicero*, Fin. II. §15, L. Havet. Restores the poetical form to the quotation (probably from Lucilius) by substituting *ille* for *qui*. We thus have three Aristophanic hemistiches. *Notes critiques sur l'Évangile de S. Matthieu et de S. Marc*, J. Viteau. In S. Matt. xxvii. 53 the words μετὰ τῆς ἑξουσίας αὐτοῦ are denounced as a gloss. Considers that vv. 8-20 of S. Mark xvi were added to replace the lost ending. But they are very old, of the second half or perhaps the middle of the first century. *Le vers saturnien*, H. Borneque. In view of the fact that no one view of the structure of the Saturnian verse is generally accepted, the writer examines the extant lines afresh and lays down three metrical rules to which he considers that they all conform. *Une liste de méléques*

*méléques*, B. Haussoullier. The name of Miletus has hitherto been wanting on the list of cities where the existence of resident-alien is proved. Evidence is here given of their existence at Miletus.

**Mnemosyne.** Vol. xxvii. Part 1. 1899.

*Adnotationes ad Bacchylidem* (Ed. Blass), H. van Herwerden. *Studia Lucretiana*, J. Woltjer. The writer discusses Lucr. iii. 402-415, 434-444, 463-471, and makes a digression on the use of *enim*, *nam*, and *namque* in Lucretius and other didactic and epic poets. In Lucr. the second syllable of *enim* is not found in thesis. The only exception is iii. 339 where we should read *non ut enim umor aquae* etc. Lucr. uses *enim* much more frequently than the other poets here named. KPHNAI KAI ΔΗΡΟΙ? J. v. L. Dindorf wrongly supposes there is a reference to some proverb in these words (Dem. Ol. iii. § 29). *Ad Apuleium*, A. V. Desertine. In *Apul. Florid.* 17 pag. 26, 10 (Kr.) for *aures spiritu observatae* we must read *aures spurcitie obs.* ARA-ARX, I. C. Vollgraff. Points out that many well known passages still require a *manus emendatrice* and as an example quotes Cic. N. D. iii. § 24 sqq. where for *tamquam* is *aram confugitis ad deum* we should read *arcan.* *Ad Horatii Carmina*, iii. 21 et 26, P. H. Damsté. That *lene tormentum admove* in iii. 21, 13 = *risum provocare* is shown by some verses of Diphilus ap. Athen. ii. 2. In iii. 26, 1 the frigid conjecture of C. Franke *vici duellis nuper idoneus* is rightly rejected, though it was approved by Meineke and admitted into the text by L. Mueller. *Hierosolyma capta*, I. M. J. Valetton. Discusses the question of the responsibility for the destruction of the temple, whether it was due to human design or fortune, and in the former case to whose design. Josephus, who wished to exculpate Titus, is subjected to minute examination. The paper is not concluded.

**Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie.** 1899. 11 Jan.

J. Wachtler, *De Alemacone Crotoniata* (Sander.) favourable. *Recueil des inscriptions juridiques Grecques*, par R. Dareste, B. Haussoullier, Th. Reinach ii. 1. (B. Kübler), very favourable. H. Willenbücher, *Cäsars Ermordung* (A. Hück). 'Too partial to Caesar.' *Firmici Materni Matheseos libri viii.*, ed. W. Kroll et F. Skutsch, i. (libri i.-iv.) (G. Némethy), 'shows most careful use of MSS.'

18 Jan. *Festgaben zu Ehren M. Büdingers von seinen Freunden und Schülern* (V. Präleke). 'J. Krall has a contribution to the history of Bokchoris the only king of the 24th Egyptian dynasty mentioned by Manetho, T. Friedrich treats of the catastrophe of Ninive, H. Swoboda offers some valuable remarks on Greek public law, A. Bauer subjects to a detailed examination the letter of Alexander the Great on the battle against Porus, H. Wirz examines the well known letter against Cicero going under the name of C. Sallustius Crispus and probably apocryphal, lastly we owe to the pen of R. von Scala a treatise on doxographic and Stoical remains in Ammianus Marcellinus.' G. Billeter, *Geschichte des Zinsfusses im griechisch-römischen Altertum* (B. Kübler), very favourable. *Sallustii Bellum Catilinae, bellum Jugurthinum, orationes et epistulae*, ed. von Th. Opitz. iii. *Die Reden und Briefe* (Ed. Wolff), 'thorough and careful.' K. Willing, *Die Thaten des Kaisers Augustus*, von ihm selbst erzählt, and *Monumentum Ancyranum*, ed. by W. Fairley (O. Güthling), favourable notice of both.



P. Cauer, *Grammatica militans* (O. Weissenfels), unfavourable.

25 Jan. G. Fougères, *Mantinté et l'Arcadie orientale* (F. Hiller von Gaertringen), very favourable. Gsell-Fels, *Oberitalien und die Riviera*, 6th edition (E. Ziegeler), 'belongs to the standard works on Italy.' O. Schwab, *Das Schlachtfeld von Cannä* (H. Stürenburg), favourable. P. Rasi, *Della così detta Patavinità di Tito Livio* (ed. Wolff), favourable. H. Schenkl, *zur Kritik und Überlieferung des Grattius* (R. Helm), 'a careful examination of the text.'

1 Feb. W. Larfeld, *Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik*. II. *Die attischen Inschriften*. I. Hälfte (E. Drerup), very favourable. Th. Hasper, *De compositione Militis gloriosi commentatio* (Fr. Hüfner), unfavourable. W. Soltan, *Livius' Geschichtswerk, seine Komposition und seine Quellen* (A. Schmidt), very favourable. J. Führer, *Forschungen zur Stillea solteranea* (V. Schultze), 'one of the most prominent publications of recent times on Christian archaeology.'

8. Feb. Fr. Devantier, *Die Spuren des anlautenden Digamma bei Hesiod*. III. (R. Peppmüller), favourable. A. Romizzi, *Antologica Omérica e Virgiliana nelle migliori versione italiane* (H.), favourable. Galeni de victu attenuante liber, primum Graece ed. C. Kalbfleisch (R. Fuchs), favourable. K. Rück, *Die Naturalis Historia des Plinius im Mittelalter* (J. Müller), favourable. *Eugippii vita Severini*, denuo rec. Th. Mommsen (G. Pfeilschifter), 'we need not praise the excellence of this edition of the text.'

15. Feb. *Bacchylidis Carmina*, ed. Fr. Blass. *Die neugefundenen Lieder des Bakchylides*. Text, Uebersetzung und Commentar von H. Jurenka. *Anthologie aus den Lyrikern der Griechen*, von E. Buchholz II. 4. A. von J. Sitzler (C. Haeblerlin), Blass has too many innovations. Jurenka's ed. is for a wider public. Sitzler gives four of the poems, viz. 2, 5, 15, 17. *Xenophonis de republica Atheniensium liber*, rec. E. Kalinka. Ed. min. (B. Buchsenschütz), good as far as it goes. C. Vitelli, *Note e appunti sull' autobiografia di Sulla* (A. Höck), 'diligent and careful.' A. Furtwängler und L. Ulrichs, *Denkmäler griechischer und römischer Skulptur* (-r), 'to be warmly recommended.'

22 Feb. M. Paulcke, *De tabula Iliaca quaestiones Stesichorae* (P. Weizsäcker), 'makes a real advance.'

J. Bochlau, *Aus ionischen und italischen Nekropolen* (K. Wernicke), favourable. *Terenti Comoediae, iterum rec. A. Fleckeisen* (J. Lezius), 'we must be thankful for this beautiful gift.' M. Sundén, *De tribunicia potestate a L. Sulla imminuta quaestiones* (W. Soltan), 'deserves attention even if the conclusions are not accepted.' P. Jahn, *Die Art der Abhängigkeit Vergils von Theokrit*. Fortsetzung (H. Morsch), deals with Ecl. 2 and part of 3, favourable. E. Kornemann, *Zur Stadtentscheidung in den ehemals keltischen und germanischen Gebieten des Römerreiches* (M. I.), favourable.

1 Mar. *Antike Denkmäler*, von O. Müller, und F. Wieseler, 4. A. von K. Wernicke. Lief. 1 (-r-), favourable. R. Helbing, *Über den Gebrauch des echten und soziativen Dativs bei Herodot* (H. Kallenberg), 'excellent.' A. Sanders, *Die Quellenkontamination im 21. und 22. Buche des Livius* (W. Soltan), favourable. M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. I. 2. A. (Fr. Harder), 'the newest literature carefully estimated.' R. v. Scala, *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums*. I. (W. Larfeld), favourable.

8 Mar. A. Müller, *Untersuchungen zu den Bühnenvorträgen* (M. Maas), favourable. K. Thiemann, *Wörterbuch zu Xenophons Hellenika*, 4. A. (E. Althaus), 'not suited for schools.' *Demos-theus' Rede vom Kranz*, herausg. von A. Stütz (P. Uhle), 'excellent.' G. Reinhold, *Das Geschichtswerk des Livius als Quelle späterer Historiker* (W. Soltan), 'very carefully done.' *Ciceros Reden für Ligarius und für Dejotarus*, herausg. von K. Rossberg. K. Rossberg, *Kommentar zu Ciceros Reden für Ligarius und für Dejotarus* (W. Hirschfelder), favourable.

**Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen.** No. 1. Jan. 1899.

The only notice of a purely classical work is H. Blümner's review of Frazer's *Pausanias*, 'Frazer's Pausanias ist im Grossen und Ganzen eine vortreffliche Leistung die unsere vollste Anerkennung verdient.' There are notices of other English books, of Butler's *Lausiac History of Palladius* (together with Preuschen's *Palladius und Rufinus*) by C. Schmidt, Robinson's *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels* by R. Pietschmann, and Conder's *The Hittites and their Language* (with Jensen's *Hittite und Armenier*); and Schäfer's *Einführung in das Neue Testament* is reviewed by Holtzmann.

## LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

*Aeschylus, Prometheus enchained*, traduit en vers français par A. Ragogne. 8vo. 56 pp. Paris, Revue bibliographique.

Aristotelis ars rhetorica. Iterum ed. A. Roemer. 12mo. iii, 245 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk. 60.

— *πολιτεία Ἀθηναίων*. Tertium ed. F. Blass. 12mo. xxxi, 245 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 80.

Bargueti (K. F.) Dido in der Geschichte und in der Dichtung. 8vo. 18 pp. Wien.

Benndorf, Festschrift für Otto Benndorf, zu seinem 60. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Schülern, Freunden und Fachgenossen, redigiert von K. Masner. 4to. xiii, 320 pp., engravings, 12 plates, Vienna, Holder. 22 Mk.

Boec (F.) Aristoteles Theophrastus Seneca de matrimonio. Accedit scriptoris christiani liber nuptialis. 8vo. 70 pp. Leipzig.

Boissier (G.) Roman Africa; Archaeological Walks in Algeria and Tunis. Translated by A. Ward. 12mo. 13, 344 pp. New York, Putnam. \$1. 75.

Brehier (L.) De graecorum iudiciorum origine. 8vo. 116 pp. Paris, Leroux.

Brown (R.) Researches into the Origin of the Primitive Constellations of the Greeks, Phoenicians, and Babylonians. Vol. I. 8vo. 378 pp. Williams & N. 10s. 6d.

Burckhardt (Jac.) Die Zeit Constantin's des Grossen. 3rd Edition. 8vo. ix, 484 pp. Leipzig, Seemann. 6 Mk.

César de bello gallico, liber 3. Text, notes, vocabulary by E. S. Shuckburgh. 12mo. 78 pp. Liber 4. 12mo. 88 pp. (Cambridge Series for Schools.) Clay. Each 1s. 6d.

César. Braungarten (F.) Ein Beitrag zur Formen-

- und Wortfügungslehre Caesars in den Comment. de bello Gallico. II. Wortfügungslehre (Accusativ). Hierzu die 'varietas' Caesars in der militärischen Terminologie und Phraseologie. 8vo. 19 pp. Smichow.
- Cagnat* (R.) L'Année épigraphique, revue des publications épigraphiques relatives à l'antiquité romaine (1898). 8vo. 60 pp., double columns. Paris, Leroux.
- Church* (A. J.) Latin Exercises. 3rd Part. 18mo. 64 pp. Seeley. 1s.
- Cicero*. Aly (F.) Ausgewählte Briefe Cicero's und seiner Zeitgenossen. Anmerkungen für den Schulgebrauch. 8vo. iii, 59 pp. Berlin, Gaertner. 1 Mk.
- De Officiis, Book 3. Introduction, Text, Notes, vocabulary by W. J. Wood. Crown 8vo. 196 pp. (Univ. Tutor. Series.) Clive. 5s. 6d.
- Philippic Orations, I. II. III. V. VII., with English notes by J. R. King. 12mo. 266 pp. Frowde. 3s. 6d.
- Selections from the Correspondence of Cicero. Ed. for sight reading by J. C. Kirtland, jr. 12mo. 103 pp. New York, American Book Co. 50 cts.
- Conway* (R. S.) Dialectorum Italicarum exempla selecta in usum Academicum edita. 8vo. Clay. 2s. 6d.
- Corpus glossariorum latinorum* a G. Loewe inchoatum, composuit, rec., ed. Geo. Goetz. Vol. VI. P. 1. Thesaurus glossarum emendatarum conf. Geo. Goetz. 8vo. x, 368 pp. Leipzig, Teubner, 18 Mk.
- Corpus inscriptionum latinarum*. Vol. XIII. Partis I. fasc. I.: Inscriptiones trium Galliarum et Germaniarum latinae, ed. O. Hirschfeld et C. Zange-meister. Pars I. fasc. I.: Inscriptiones Aquitaniae et Lugdunensis. folio. 38, 519 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 58 Mk.
- Corpus inscriptionum latinarum*. Vol. XVI. II. Fasc. I.: Dressel (H.) Inscriptiones urbis Romae latinae. Instrumentum domesticum. Folio. pp. 491-996, 2 plates. Berlin, Reimer. 56 Mk.
- Corraini* (F.) Storia della marina militare antica. Vol. V. VI. (La marina in Virgilio; le tavole ottiche di Marina. 8vo. xxxviii, 382 pp.; xvi, 418 pp., 15 plates. Turin, 60 lire.
- Democritus*. Oder (Eug.) Ein angebliches Bruchstück Demokrits über die Entdeckung unterirdischer Quellen. 8vo. 158 pp. Leipzig, Dieterich. 4 Mk. 50.
- (Aus 'Philologus' VII. Suppl. Vol.)
- Demosthenes*. Speech on the Crown. Text, Introduction and Notes, by E. Abbott and P. E. Matheson. 12mo. 280 pp. Frowde. 3s. 6d.
- Eller* (A.) u. L. Radernmacher, Analecta Graeca. 4to. 47 pp. Bonn.
- Ephemeris epigraphica*, corporis inscriptionum latinarum supplementum, cura Th. Mommsen, I. B. Ross, O. Hirschfeld. Vol. VIII. fasc. 3. 8vo. pp. 351-620. Berlin, Reimer. 12 Mk.
- Ermatinger* (E.) Die attische Autochthonensage bis auf Euripides. Mit einer einleitenden Darstellung der Bedeutung und Entwicklung der attischen Sage bis auf Euripides. 8vo. 148 pp. Zürich.
- Euripides*, Hercules furens, edited by F. A. Hort. Crown 8vo. Middle Form Series. Rivington.
- Euripidis Fabulae*, ed. R. Prinz et N. Wecklein. Vol. II. Pts. III. et IV. (Bacchae—Heraclidae, ed. N. Wecklein.) 8vo. 71: v, 52 pp. 2 Mk. each.
- Fabulae. Vol. II. P. V. Hercules, ed N. Wecklein. 8vo. v, 72 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.
- Medea. Lyrical parts done into English, with Introduction, Notes, Vocabulary by P. B. Halcombe. 12mo. 124 pp. Black. 1s. 6d.
- Fried* (P. F.) Ueber die Schlacht bei Cannä. 8vo. 46 pp., map. Leipzig.
- Fulgentii* (F. Planciadis) Opera. Acced. F. Claudii Gordiani Fulgentii de aetatibus mundi et hominis et S. Fulgentii Episcopi super Thebaiden. Rec. R. Helm. 12mo. xvi, 216 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 4 Mk.
- Furtwängler* (A.) Neuere Fälschungen von Antiken. 4to. 39 pp., engravings. Leipzig, Giesecke und Devrient. 5 Mk.
- Grunau* (G.) Inschriften und Darstellungen römischer Kaiser Münzen von Augustus bis Diocletian. xvi, 152 pp., 4 plates. Bern.
- Handbook of Rome and the Campagna. 16th ed. 12mo. 622 pp., 94 maps and plans. Murray. 10s.
- Helbig* (W.) Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom. (In 2 vols.) Vol. I. Die vatikanische Skulpturensammlung, die kapitolinischen und das lateranische Museum, das Magazino Archeologico Comunale auf dem Caelius. 2nd ed. Crown 8vo. x, 506 pp. Engravings. Leipzig, Teubner. The two vols., 15 Mk.
- Helbling* (K.) Der Zug der Cimbern und Teutonen. 8vo. 68 pp. Zürich.
- Herakleitos*. Wendland (P.) Ein Wort des Heraklit im Neuen Testament. 8vo. 9 pp. Berlin.
- Herodotus*. Dietrich (Rud.) Testimonia de Herodoti vita. 8vo. 41 pp. Leipzig, Simmel. 1 Mk.
- Hervieux* (L.) Les fabulistes latins depuis le siècle d'Auguste jusqu'à la fin du moyen âge. Vol. IV. Études de Cheriton et ses dérivés. 8vo. viii, 483 pp. Paris, Didot. 12 fr.
- Hind* (R. D. Archer) and R. D. Hicks. Greek and Latin Cambridge Compositions. Crown 8vo. 508 pp. Clay. 10s.
- Hodgkin* (T.) The Walls, Gates, and Aqueducts of Rome. 8vo. 52 pp. Murray. 2s. 6d.
- Homerus*. Oeuvres complètes. Traduction nouvelle avec une introduction et des notes par P. Gicquet. 16mo. v, 736 pp. Paris, Hachette. 3 f. 50 c.
- Brunnhöfer (H.) Homerische Rätsel. Die Homerischen Epitheta ornamta etymologisch und historisch-geographisch gedeutet. 8vo. xv, 136 pp. Leipzig, Friedrich. 5 Mk.
- Horatii Opera*, edd. O. Keller et A. Holder. Vol. I. Carmina, epoda, carmen saeculare. Iterum rec. O. Keller. 8vo. cvii, 453 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 12 Mk.
- Hawrlant (F.) Horaz als Freund der Natur nach seinen Gedichten. III. 8vo. 33 pp. Landskron.
- Zambra, Poesie Oraziane volgarizzate e commentate. (Schluss.) 8vo. 58 pp. Tarent.
- Horatius*. Mueller (Max.) Num Horatii satirarum liber prior retractatus sit. 8vo. 45 pp. Jena, Pohle. 1 Mk. 20.
- Huddleston* (J. H.) Key to Essentials of New Testament Greek. 16mo. 6, 20 pp. New York, Macmillan Co. 25 cts.
- Jahrbücher (Neue) für das Klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur und für Pädagogik, herausgegeben von J. Ilberg und Rich. Richter. Vol. III. Pt. I. 8vo. 80, 64 pp., 2 engravings, 2 plates. Leipzig, Teubner. Each Jahrgang (2 vols.) 25 Mk.
- Jenny* (S.) Die römische Begräbnisstätte von Brigtanium. Oestlicher Theil. Herausgegeben von der k. k. Centralkommission. 4to. 20 pp., engravings, 8 plates. Vienna, Braumüller. 11 Mk.
- Jurisprudentiae antehadrianae quae supersunt* ed. F. P. Bremer. Pars II. Primi post principatum

- constitutum saeculi juris consulti. Sectio I. 12mo. iv, 582 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.
- Kaerst (J.) Studien zur Entwicklung u. theoretischen Begründung der Monarchie im Altertum. 8vo. 100 pp. Leipzig.
- Kenyon (F. G.) Palaeography of Greek Papyri. 8vo. Frowde. 10s. 6d.
- Kirchhoff (Chr.) Dramatische Orchestik der Hellenen. 8vo. vi, 511 pp., 2 plates. Leipzig, Teubner. 20 Mk.
- Köhler (R.) Analecta Hellenica. 8vo. 40 pp. Leipzig.
- Köhler (U.) Das asiatische Reich des Antigonos. 8vo. 20 pp. Berlin.
- Lane (G. M.) Latin Grammar for Schools. Crown 8vo. 588 pp. Harper. 6s.
- Lindström (A.) L'analogie dans la déclinaison des substantifs latins en Gaule. I. 8vo. xi, 323 pp. Upsala.
- Longinus. On the Sublime. The Greek Text edited after the Paris MS. with Introduction, etc. by W. Rhys Roberts. 8vo. Camb. Univ. Press. 9s.
- Lucian. Schmidt (O.) Metapher und Gleichnis in den Schriften Lukians. 8vo. 138 pp. Zürich.
- Ludwich (A.) Kritische Beiträge zu den poetischen Erzeugnissen griechischer Magie und Theosophie. 4to. 24 pp. Königsberg, Akad. Buchhandlung. 50 Pf.
- Lydi (Jo. Laurentii) liber de mensibus, ed. R. Wünsch. 12mo. xcv, 202 pp., engraving, Leipzig, Teubner. 5 Mk. 20.
- Mackail (J. W.) Latin literature 3rd impression. Crown 8vo. 298 pp. (Univ. Extension Series.) Murray. 3s. 6d.
- Maclagan (C.) Catalogue Raisonné of the British Museum Collection of Rubbings from ancient sculptured stones. 4to. 106 pp. Douglas. 2s. 6d.
- Mahaffy (J. P.) History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty. Crown 8vo. 276 pp. Methuen. 6s.
- Milne (J. G.) History of Egypt under Roman Rule. Crown 8vo. 276 pp. Methuen. 6s.
- Mücke (Ch.) Vom Euphrat zum Tiber. Untersuchungen zur alten Geschichte. 8vo. 110 pp. Leipzig, Pfeiffer. 3 Mk.
- (Die Legende von den athenischen Tyrannenstürzern. Die römische Geschichtslegende. Die Ueberlieferung über Alexander, etc.)
- Müller (Alb.) Untersuchungen zu den Bühnenalterthümern. 8vo. 116 pp., 1 plate. Leipzig, Dieterich. 2 Mk. 80.
- (Aus 'Philologus' VII. Suppl. Vol.)
- Müller (C. O.) Fund F. Wieseler, Antike Denkmäler zur griechischen Götterlehre. 4th Edition, by Kon. Wernicke. Denkmäler der alten Kunst. Vol. II. Pt. I. Zeus, Hera. 8vo. 140 pp., and 10 plates in obl. 4to. Leipzig, Dieterich. 5 Mk.
- Münzen (die antiken) Nordgriechenlands, unter Leitung von F. Imhoof Blumer herausgegeben von der K. Akademie der Wissenschaften. Vol. I. Part I. Pick (B.) die antiken Münzen von Dacien und Mösien. 4to. xv, 518 pp. 20 plates. Berlin, Reimer. 54 Mk.
- Nepos. Vol. I. Text, introduction, notes, vocabulary by H. Wilkinson. 18mo. 168 pp. (Elementary Classics.) Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Nerrlich (P.) Ein Nachwort zum Dognia vom klassischen Altertum. 9 Briefe an Julius Schwarcz. 8vo. 76 pp. Leipzig, Hirschfeld. 2 Mk.
- Novatian epistula de cibis iudaicis. Herausgegeben von G. Landgraf und C. Weyman. (Aus 'Archiv für latein. Lexicographie und Grammatik.') 8vo. 29 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.
- Russell (E.) Das Lykurgproblem. 8vo. 74 pp. Erlangen.
- Olcott (G. N.) Studies in the word-formation of the Latin inscriptions: substantives and adjectives. With special reference to the Latin sermo vulgaris. 8vo. xxvi, 267 pp. Rome.
- Oman (C. W. C.) Elementary history of Greece to the death of Alexander the Great. 18mo. 242 pp., maps. Rivington. 2s.
- Orszulik (K.) Beispiele zur griechischen Syntax aus Xenophon, Demosthenes und Platon. 8vo. 38 pp. Teschen.
- Ovidii Nasonis (P.) carmina selecta. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von Jos. Golling. 3rd Edition. 8vo. xvi, 230 pp. Wien, Holder. 1 Mk. 60.
- Ovidius. Némethy (G.) De libris amorum Ovidianis. 8vo. 27 pp. Budapest, Lampel. 1 Mk.
- Panegyrici. Chruzsander (C. G.) De elocutione Panegyricorum veterum Gallicanorum quaestiones. 8vo. 115 pp. Upsala.
- Paoli (Ces.) Grundriss zu Vorlesungen über lateinische Palaeographie und Urkundenlehre. Vol. III. Urkundenlehre. Part I. Aus dem Italienischen übersetzt von K. Lohmeyer. 8vo. 212 pp. Innsbruck, Wagner. 4 Mk.
- Petronius. Satyricon, in Prose and Verse. Englished by Mr. Wilson. 8vo. Smithers. 21s.
- Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt, edd. L. Cohn et P. Wendland. Vol. III. Ed. P. Wendland. 8vo. xxiv, 306 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 9 Mk.
- Pindar. Brandt (P.) De particularum subiunctivarum apud Pindarum usu. 8vo. 62 pp. Leipzig.
- Plato. Apology. Introduction, text, notes and translation by T. R. Mills. Crown 8vo. 130 pp. Clive. 4s. 6d.
- Judgment of Socrates, being the Apology, Crito, and the closing scene of Phaedo, with Introduction, translated by P. E. Moore. 16mo. (Riverside liter. ser. No. 129). Boston, Houghton, M. & Co. 15 cts.
- Lengsteiner (S. J.) Plato als Erzieher. 8vo. 55 pp. Kalksburg.
- Nettleship (R. L.) Lectures on the Republic of Plato, ed. by G. R. Benson. Crown 8vo. 272 pp. Macmillan. 8s. 6d. net.
- Plautus. Audouin (E.) De Plautinis anapaestis. 8vo. xii, 289 pp. Paris, Klincksieck.
- Plinii (Caecilii C.) Epistularum liber I. Text, introduction, notes, vocabulary by C. J. Phillips. 18mo. 76 pp. (Elementary Classics.) Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Plotinus. Scharrenbroich (F.) Plotini de pulchro doctrina. 8vo. 44 pp. Halle.
- Plutarch. Jäger (J.) Zur Kritik von Amyots Uebersetzung der Moralia Plutarchs. 8vo. 107 pp. Heidelberg.
- Poetarum graecorum fragmenta, auctore U. de Wilamowitz—Moellendorff collecta. Part VI. Comicorum graecorum fragmenta, ed. Geo. Kaibel. Vol. I. Fasc. I. Doriensium comoedia Mimi Phylaces. 8vo. viii, 256 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 10 Mk.
- Polybius. Ullrich (H.) De Polybii fontibus Rhodiis. 8vo. 32 pp. Leipzig.
- Poseidippos. Diels (H.) Die Elegie des Poseidippos aus Theben. 8vo. 12 pp., 2 plates. Berlin, Reimer. 50 Pf.
- (Aus Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften.)
- Proverbie detti sapienziali latini, raccolti, volgarizzati e confrontati con altri italiani da Luigi C. Borghi. 4to. 198 pp. Venezia. 4 lire.
- Quintilian. (Loth, J.) Die paedagogischen Gedanken der institutio oratoria Quintilians. 8vo. 76 pp. Leipzig.

- Ribbeck.* Wachsmuth (C.) Worte zum Gedächtniss an O. Ribbeck. 8vo. 22 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 60 Pf.  
(Aus 'Berichte der sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften'.)
- Riemann* (O.) et H. Goelzer. Grammaire comparée du grec et du latin: Syntaxe. 8vo. 895 pp. Paris, Colin. 25 frs.
- Sammlung der griechischen Dialektinschriften. Vol. II. Part 6 (last). Baunack (Joh.) Die delphischen Inschriften. (Pt. IV. Nos. 2501-2993.) 8vo. pp. 643-963. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und R. 9 Mk. 80.
- Schreiner* (Jos.) Hercules redivivus. Die Hauptgestalten der Hellenensage an der Hand der Sprachenvergleichung zurückgeführt auf ihre historischen Prototypen 7 Retrometamorphosen. 8vo. viii, 112 pp. Mainz, Kirchheim. 1 Mk. 50.
- Schröder* (H.) Lukrez und Thucydides. Eine Studie zum sechsten Buche des Lukrez. 8vo. 36 pp. Strassburg.
- Schwab* (J.) Nomina latina oriunda a participiis praesentis activi, futuri passivi, futuri activi. Particula altera. 8vo. 38 pp. Bonn.
- Schweizer* (E.) Grammatik der Pergamenischen Inschriften. Beiträge zur Laut- und Flexionslehre der gemeingriechischen Sprache. 8vo. viii, 212 pp. Zürich.
- Seneca* (L. Annaei.) Opera, quae supersunt, Vol. III.: Ad Lucilium epistolarum moralium quae supersunt, ed. O. Hense. Crown 8vo. xl, 621 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 5 Mk. 60.
- Simon* (J. A.) Akrosticha bei den augusteischen Dichtern. (Exoterische Studien Pt. II.) Mit Anhang: Akrostichische und telestichische Texte aus der Zeit von Plautus bis auf Crestien de Troyes und Wolfram von Eschenbach. 8vo. viii, 240 pp. Köln, Verlagsanstalt. 4 Mk.
- Sittl* (K.) Dionysisches Dichten und Treiben im 7. und 6. Jahrhundert v. Chr. (v.-vii. Jahresbericht des Kunstgesch. Museums [von Wagner'sche Stiftung] der Universität Würzburg. xxix. Programm. 4to. 46 pp., 12 engravings, 3 plates. Würzburg, Stahel. 2 Mk. 50.
- Solon.* Krassnig (J.) Zur Erklärung der in Aristoteles 'Aθηναίων πολιτεία' enthaltenen Fragmente Solons. 8vo. 11 pp. Mähr.-Osterr.
- Stritar* (J.) Gedächtnisverse zur lateinischen Casuslehre. 8vo. 8 pp. Wien.
- Tacitus.* Parker (E. H.) Subject matter of Tacitus, Annals I.-III., including full index to Persons and Places. Crown 8vo. 128 pp. (Handbooks to Pass Schools.) Simpkin. 2s. 6d.
- Dialogus de oratoribus. Introduction and Notes by A. Gudeman. Crown 8vo. Putnam. 5s.
- Thomson* (A. D.) Euripides and the Attic Orators, a comparison. 8vo. 202 pp. Macmillan. 6s. net.
- Thucydides*, Buch VI.-VIII. Textausgabe für den Schulgebrauch von S. Widmann. 8vo. xxii, 317 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 80.
- Tragoedien (Griechische). Übersetzt von U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. Vol. I. (4 parts). 1. Sophocles. Oedipus (84 pp.). 2. Euripides. Hippolytus (99 pp.). 3. Euripides, Der Mütter Bittgang (91 pp.). 4. Euripides, Heracles (85 pp.). 8vo. 355 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 6 Mk.
- Turner* (C. H.) Ecclesiae Occidentalis monumenta juris antiquissima. Fasc. I. pars I. 4to. Frowde. 10s. 6d.
- Vergil.* Aeneid, Book 9. 12. Edited with Notes and Vocabulary by A. Sidgwick. 12mo. 112, 118 pp. (Cambridge Series for Schools and Training Colleges.) Cambridge Univ. Press. Each 1s. 6d.
- Eneid, Liber 11., edited for schools by T. E. Page. Vocabulary by G. H. Nall. 18mo. 189 pp. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Wilbrandt* (M.) Die politische und soziale Bedeutung der attischen Geschlechter vor Solon. 8vo. 95 pp. Leipzig, Dieterich. 2 Mk. 40.  
(Aus 'Philologus' VIII. Suppl. Vol.)
- Xenophon*, Anabasis. Book 4. Text, Introduction, Notes, Vocabulary by G. M. Edwards. 12mo. 144 pp. (Cambridge Series for Schools.) Clay. 1s. 6d.
- Xenophon*, Hellenica. Books 1, 2. Text, Introduction and Notes by G. M. Edwards. 12mo, 216 pp. (Pitt Press Series.) Cambridge Univ. Press. 3s. 6d.
- Ziebarth* (E.) Neue attische Grenzsteine. 8vo. 9 pp. Berlin.